1		Wednesday, 30 November 2022
2	(10	.00 am)
3	LOR	D BRACADALE: Good morning, Ms Caffrey.
4	A.	Morning, sir.
5	LOR	D BRACADALE: You're going to be asked questions by
6		Ms Grahame. Before that would you say the words of the
7		affirmation after me.
8		MS JOANNE CAFFREY (affirmed)
9		
10		Questions from MS GRAHAME
11	LOR	D BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
12	MS	GRAHAME: Thank you.
13		Good morning, Ms Caffrey.
14	Α.	Good morning.
15	Q.	You are Joanne Caffrey?
16	Α.	Yes, that's correct.
17	Q.	And essentially you have been asked to prepare a report
18		on behalf of the Inquiry.
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	And all of your details, contact details and such-like,
21		are available within the content of that?
22	A.	Yes.
23	Q.	I won't go into those in any detail. Could we begin
24		just by looking at that report please. It's SBPI00181.
25		Now, this will come up on the screen, but you also have

1		a full hard copy in the folder in front of you.
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	I don't intend to take you through the entire report
4		page by page today, but if at any time you feel there's
5		something within your report that you would like to
6		refer to, please don't hesitate to let me know.
7	A.	Okay.
8	Q.	And we can have that brought up on the screen if that's
9		necessary at any point.
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	Okay, thank you. It's a lengthy report and contains
12		a number of appendices, with documents attached and your
13		full CV and such-like.
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	So we see from page 1 it says "Joanne Caffrey, expert
16		witness", and it relates to Mr Bayoh. If we can move up
17		slightly, it relates to the events on 3 May 2015 and the
18		date of this report is 31 October 2022.
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	And then we see just below that, if we can move up the
21		screen slightly, it says it is:
22		"Prepared at the request of:
23		"The Public Inquiry into the death of Sheku Bayoh."
24		And there's a caveat there and that says:
25		"The opinions expressed in the following chapters

1		are based on the evidence and information available to
2		me as at the date of this report. Should further
3		relevant evidence or information become available, I may
4		require to reconsider my opinions."
5	Α.	Yes.
6	Q.	And so this document was prepared by you on
7		31 October
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	on the basis of information you had up to that date?
10	Α.	Yes, that's correct.
11	Q.	But and this report, does it express your views on
12		these matters as at that date and it's an accurate
13		representation of the views that you formed looking at
14		various items of information and things you had been
15		provided with by the Inquiry?
16	Α.	Yes, that's correct.
17	Q.	You in order to prepare this report were you also
18		sent a number of other documents? Let's look briefly at
19		SBPI00167 and this we can just scroll through that.
20		This is an appendix which is an inventory of the
21		disclosed evidence, so evidence that you were given by
22		the Inquiry to consider as part of your reflections on
23		the case.
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	And it contained links to evidence that had been heard

1		in our first hearing, statements, PIRC statements,
2		Inquiry statements
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	and a number of other documents that are all listed
5		there.
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	I know we're going through this very quickly, but
8		I understand you have seen this before?
9	A.	Yes, I have, yes.
10	Q.	In addition, after you were sent all of those documents,
11		were you sent a further inventory, which was SBPI00178,
12		and this is additionally disclosed documents and it
13		contained training logs, STORM logs, transcripts of
14		emergency calls, statements from a Scott Masterton and
15		then other papers?
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	Thank you. Just to be clear, all of the documents that
18		are listed in the inventory and the supplementary
19		inventory were available to you prior to completing your
20		report on 31 October?
21	Α.	Yes, that's correct.
22	Q.	Thanks. Then after you completed your report
23		in October, were you also sent further documents by the
24		Inquiry team in order to update you on information that
25		was becoming available to the Inquiry

1	Α.	Yes, that's correct.
2	Q.	after you had finished. And let me just look for
3		a moment at the there were supplementary statements
4		that were sent to you
5	Α.	Mm-hm.
6	Q.	that contained statements from an Inspector Kay?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	An Inspector Stewart?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	There was a statement from Mr Masterton?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	Michelle Hutchison?
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	Sergeant Bisset?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	Sergeant Dalgleish?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	And a Ms Anthony?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	And then you were sent an inspector's job profile and
21		a contact management SOP.
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	And you were also sent a report from Mr Martin Graves.
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	And you hadn't seen that report prior to completing your

1		report?
2	A.	No.
3	Q.	Thank you. But you have seen it since subsequently?
4	A.	Yes, I have.
5	Q.	And have you also seen statements from a PC Wood who was
6		the dog handler?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	And you were sent an up-to-date position statement from
9		Police Scotland?
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	Have I missed anything out?
12	A.	No, I don't think so.
13	Q.	Right. And then since the start of this hearing were
14		you also asked to view the evidence that was being led
15		last week?
16	A.	Yes, I have watched the evidence.
17	Q.	So that included oral evidence from Inspector Kay and
18		Inspector Stewart?
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	Martin Graves?
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	He spanned into Monday.
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	And Gary Wood as well, the dog handler?
25	A.	Yes.

1	Q.	Lovely. I would like to begin is there anything we
2		have not sent you, first of all, that we should have,
3		that you would have expected to see that was missing?
4	A.	Nothing that comes to mind.
5	Q.	Thank you. I would like to begin by looking at your CV.
6		Now, the Chair will have your full report available to
7		him to consider at length, but I would like to just
8		touch on some of your experience.
9	A.	Okay.
10	Q.	Could we begin by looking at page 18 of your report and
11		I think from pages 18 to 27 you actually set out your
12		own background and you also say at this section your
13		full CV is at appendix N of this report.
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	So in the report we see from pages 18 to 27 a summary of
16		your background, plus that is supplemented by the full
17		CV attached.
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	Going through some of your experience, am I right in
20		saying you were a police officer for almost 24 years?
21	Α.	Yes, 23 and a half.
22	Q.	23 and a half, and you became a police officer in 1990?
23	Α.	Yes, February of 1990.
24	Q.	And that was with the Cumbria Constabulary?
25	A.	Yes.

1 Q. And then from 1996 to 2003 you were a sergeant?

- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Tell us a little about that.

4 Α. So in 1996 I was an acting sergeant and as the acting 5 sergeant in a small town called Penrith, I would change between operational on the street and the custody 6 7 function. Then in 1997 I was promoted to a full-time 8 sergeant and my first posting was to the custody unit in 9 Kendal, so then between 1997 and 2003 there were no set 10 time periods for doing the different roles, I would be in and out and flexible between the roles, so I was 11 12 custody sergeant for anything between three months or 13 18 months at a time, patrol sergeant which again would 14 be anything between three months and a year at a time, 15 and I was also a PSU sergeant. The PSU, public --Police Support Unit, or it was commonly called task 16 17 force in those days. I would be used either for pre-planned events such as at Sellafield nuclear 18 19 establishment for planned protests, or when the PSU 20 full-time sergeant did acting rank roles, I would then 21 cover for his absence, so I know at one point I did his 22 role -- I think it was for three months, but it may have 23 been two, but it was somewhere between the eight and 12 weeks that I covered on a full-time basis there. 24 And when you say you were a patrol sergeant, what does 25 Q.

1 that mean?

2	Α.	So the patrol sergeant's responsible for the briefing of
3		the shift, all officers on duty, deployment, attending
4		the incidents with the officers, so it's all the
5		day-to-day risk assessment, the deployment plans, the
6		liaison then with the local inspector, so just dealing
7		with the personnel and the priorities.
8	Q.	And then you were a sergeant or acting sergeant
9		initially for a year and then
10	Α.	Well, no, sorry, the acting sergeant was just for part
11		of that. I think that was a three months acting at the
12		end of 1996.
13	Q.	Sorry.
14	Α.	Then it was into 1997 when I was promoted full-time.
15	Q.	So from 1997 to 2003 you were a full-time sergeant.
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	Carrying out different roles, depending on where you
18		were sent?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	And after 2003, so moving into 2004, what were you doing
21		at that stage?
22	Α.	Then I was deployed into the training department for the
23		force and I was initially involved in the design of the
24		Professionalising Investigations Programme and then
25		after the design and delivery of that for a couple of

1		years I then took over as head of specialist training,
2		which was in relation to the primary roles was
3		custody training, all of the use of force and first aid.
4		They were the three core subjects.
5	Q.	And you were the head of that department?
6	Α.	Of that team, yes.
7	Q.	That team. And how long did you do that role, the
8		training role?
9	Α.	Until 2008 when I then went to a newly created role
10		called it was called civil contingencies and
11		emergency planning, but it was in light of all the new
12		command and control documentations that and processes
13		that were coming in.
14	Q.	Tell us about that role.
15	Α.	Because it was a newly created team and a new role,
16		the head of the team was a chief inspector and because
17		chief inspector is one of the gold level ranks and he
18		was looking for a second-in-command which could have
19		either been an inspector or a sergeant, but it was more
20		focused on the skill set that that person was going to
21		bring to the role rather than rank specific.
22		They were looking then for creation of training
23		materials, delivery of training to increase the force's
24		preparedness for major incidents and general business as
25		usual command and control functions.

1		We were also going to be working with the
2		multi-agency partners at gold, silver and bronze levels
3		so there was also going to be a combined training role
4		in relation to the multi-agency working for major and
5		emergency incidents.
6	Q.	Right. Can I just ask you one or two more questions
7		about that.
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	You have said business as usual for the command and
10		control functions, what does that mean?
11	Α.	Because day in day out there's always a command and
12		control function, so, for example, the area control room
13		is a 24/7, instantly available, tactical command, silver
14		command, so that is your business as usual command and
15		control function in place, but then for emergency
16		incidents, major incidents, unusual incidents,
17		pre-planned incidents with potential, you would then
18		have an established gold, silver and command unit
19		working alongside of the daily business as well.
20	Q.	Would you be able to explain briefly about this
21		gold/silver command?
22	Α.	Yes. So gold, silver and command is the very core of
23		what command and control is about and how I used to
24		explain it when I was delivering training to the
25		multi-agencies and trying to bring them into

1 understanding what it's about rather than keeping it police orientated, I would take it to a scenario of 2 3 getting a fitted kitchen, that the gold command would be 4 the client who wants the kitchen and they would set the 5 parameters, so they would say the parameter is the maximum budget, they would say roughly what colour they 6 7 wanted, how many hobs they wanted, so they would give 8 the basic parameters.

9 Q. And that would be the gold level?

10 A. That would be the gold level.

Then at silver that's your tactical plan, so that 11 12 would be the kitchen designer who would then come up 13 with the plan and agree that that fit then within the 14 gold strategy, so then once that was agreed at bronze 15 level you're looking at -- that's your team of fitters and joiners who will get the plan from the silver and 16 17 they would have to then try and make that plan fit. So 18 they would have minor deviations within that, for 19 example if they then realised there was an extra 6-foot 20 of plumbing that needed put in, that would be within 21 their parameters, as long as it then didn't go out of 22 the budget, but other than that if there was any 23 significant tactical change they would have to go back to the silver for agreement of variation of the tactical 24 25 plan.

1	Q.	So that's how the gold, silver and bronze command would
2		fit together?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	But with the ultimate goal of securing a kitchen in your
5		analogy.
6	Α.	Yes, yes.
7	Q.	And there are different levels that they each each
8		role is distinct
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	but they work together?
11	Α.	Yes, and different parameters whereby they've got
12		flexibility within those parameters, but if it's going
13		to go outside of those parameters it needs to feed back
14		up. So if at that bottom level there was going to be
15		some additional cost or time, they would have to feed
16		that back to tactical who would then maybe need to go
17		back to gold to seek consent and permission for the
18		extra expense.
19	Q.	So there's liaison between each of them as well?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	So you have said that you were doing the emergency
22		planning at 2008?
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	Did you have special training in relation to that role?
25	Α.	Yes. My initial training was delivered by the

1		Cabinet Office at the emergency planning college.
2	Q.	Right. And how long did you perform that role?
3	Α.	It was five years in total, from 2008 to 2013.
4	Q.	And can you tell us a little bit the nature of that role
5		when you were doing it?
6	Α.	So it had functions in relation to day-to-day business,
7		so planning-wise and preparedness-wise, but then it also
8		had the training function in order to increase the force
9		preparedness, so that involved trying to teach as many
10		people throughout the entire force, from constable and
11		civilian equivalent to chief constable, through
12		simulated exercises and scenarios, but then it also
13		meant in real events we would act as advisors to gold,
14		silver and bronze command, so at real events the chief
15		inspector, he would be the advisor to the police
16		gold command team. If it was a multi-agency
17		gold command team I would then act as the advisor to the
18		multi-agency gold command but I would also then be
19		liaising with the tactical commanders, so the area
20		control room inspector.

If it was a police only incident the chief inspector would take the police gold, I would take the silver as an advisor and then the constables and civilians that I had within my team, they would act as bronze command or additional support within the gold and silver

1		function.
2	Q.	So you were part of the emergency planning. Was it
3		a unit, is that what or a department?
4	A.	It was a unit, yes.
5	Q.	A unit.
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	And you would be treated as a source of advice by
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	others performing the role?
10	Α.	Yes, which would often mean call-out through the night,
11		even sometimes just being contacted by the control room
12		for verbal advice over the phone in relation to maybe
13		plans that we had, or what should they do, or how to
14		establish do they need, for example, to set up
15		a separate command and control structure.
16	Q.	So as advisors I think you said your the head of that
17		unit was the chief inspector?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	And you were his deputy?
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	And you would sit as advisors next to an ongoing gold,
22		silver, command situation on the ground?
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	And you would also assist third parties?
25	Α.	Yes, so the design of the building the control

1 room -- my office, which I shared with the chief 2 inspector, was as soon as you came out of the control 3 room our office was the first office that you came to 4 and then next to us then was my team and then we had 5 a command suite next to that which was a large room, large table, but then we also had plans for all of 6 7 the -- the entire floor of that building to be evicted 8 on immediate notice so that we could open all those 9 rooms up for multi-agencies' use for any major events. 10 Q. What's a multi-agency? So we're obligated -- under the UK requirements we're 11 Α. 12 obligated to have multi-agency response plans for any 13 major incident, so all your category 1 responders such 14 as police, fire, the ambulance service, the 15 health authorities, and then you would have the likes of the health and safety executive. There could end up 16 17 being -- and on average if we brought all of the teams out we could easily have 100 people across that corridor 18 of various different roles and those roles would depend 19 20 on what the nature of the event was, so the biggest 21 incident we had was severe weather where we had vital 22 supplies such as gas, electricity all disconnected through bridges collapsing, so we had a lot of the 23 utility agencies there as well, so their 24 25 chief executives acting as gold command and then we

1		would have multi-agency gold command meetings in
2		addition to police gold command meetings and
3		multi-agency silver meetings, in addition to police only
4		meetings.
5	Q.	And you were part of the unit advising those
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	multi-agencies?
8	A.	So I would act as the advisor for the silver command
9		which would usually be led by the control room
10		inspector, or their additional one that was brought in.
11		If it was decided we needed a permanent inspector on
12		that role, there would be another control room inspector
13		brought out because they have the most training in
14		relation to other inspectors for command and control.
15	Q.	So in terms of understanding where your role as an
16		advisor fitted in, you would be advising the inspector
17		level, which was viewed as a silver command position?
18	A.	Yes, so although I could advise at gold and I did on
19		several occasions, my predominantly my role was to
20		advise at the silver command, which was the control room
21		inspector.
22	Q.	And your senior officer, the chief inspector who is
23		the head of that emergency planning unit, he would if

he was present and available, he would be advising the

gold command which would be another chief inspector

25

24

1 somewhere perhaps? 2 Or the chief officer team such as chief constable, Α. 3 deputy or assistant, but until he got there -- because 4 I lived closer and he -- I could be there within about 5 ten minutes. He was typically there within about 40 minutes, so often initially if it was a call-out through 6 7 the night I would be with gold until he came and then 8 I would go to silver. Right and you did that for five years, did you say? 9 Q. 10 Α. Yes. And did you deal with a number of major incidents --11 Q. 12 Α. Absolutely, yes --13 -- during that time? Q. 14 -- of varying degrees. There was firearms, there was Α. 15 severe weather, there was bus collisions where children -- you know, school bus, all children, two 16 17 children die. 18 So any major incident? Q. 19 Any major incident or unusual incident because the Α. 20 theory would be you've got business as usual and at the 21 other extreme you've got your major incidents, but then 22 in-between otherwise you've got this void of one way or the other that would be called an unusual incident and 23 24 an unusual incident would be one where you have maybe 25 not got enough information to put it to a major, but

1 it's beyond the normal run-of-the-mill, day-to-day, business as usual and that might either be because of 2 3 the level of risk, or because of the implications with 4 it, or it's using more additional staff than you might 5 have, or you might need the assistance of another agency being involved, so it might be that you're needing to 6 7 call on the ambulance crew, for example, as support and 8 asking them to do something that isn't business as 9 usual. 10 Q. And can you help the Chair understand by use of an example of what an unusual incident would be? 11 12 Α. So an unusual incident -- if, for example, the police 13 suspected something, so they suspect a firearms 14 incident, one of the initial considerations at 15 a suspected firearms incident is to consider ambulance attendance, to be on standby, so if you're then seeking 16 17 for the ambulance crew -- because you haven't got this incident declared as a firearms, it's declared as 18 a suspected firearms, you're then asking the ambulance 19 20 crew to go outside of their business as usual to deploy 21 an ambulance to then sit at a location in case they're 22 needed, so that would be definitely an unusual incident because we're doing things slightly different, or it 23 24 could be that we have reached capacity in a custody 25 unit, so operational capacity is now affected because we

1		can no longer accept any detainees at that custody unit,
2		or because of the level of risk of a small number of
3		detainees, or one detainee, they're having to close the
4		custody unit to everybody, so that would become unusual
5		because then strategies would have to be designed for
6		is there issued an instruction about detention, or are
7		they going to then install processes to move detainees
8		from one location to two hours away, or
9	Q.	Right. And then business as usual, would your unit have
10		any involvement in that?
11	Α.	No.
12	Q.	No. Thank you. Then in 2013 am I right in saying you
13		left
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	the Police Service?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	In order to and then you became you trained and
18		became a skilled witness and you have given a number of
19		reports since then?
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	I won't move on to that for a moment, but can I ask you
22		to give the Chair an example of the sort of work you did
23		when you were a sergeant working with a team perhaps, of
24		any situations where you came across a knife incident?
25	A.	Yes. So one knife incident that springs to mind it

started off as a business as usual call. It was a call that there was a disturbance at a particular address, so a neighbour had rung in just saying "There's a bit of noise", so it sounded on the basis of it it was just a routine police call.

On this particular night in question it was a public 6 7 holiday. I was the sergeant. I was down to minimum 8 staff. I had three -- if I remember correctly, I had 9 three constables on duty. I had one constable single 10 crewed in a vehicle and I had two constables in the van. Of those two constables the man was a probationer, so he 11 12 didn't have his two years' service in and then there was 13 a female officer with him and I think -- I'm not sure 14 but I think she maybe had around five years, but I could 15 be wrong. She certainly wasn't a probationer but she had a bit more service, but not as much as what I did. 16

17 Because of the address that was given over the air, I recognised this address as being an address -- it was 18 a house that was converted into at least three bedsits 19 20 that were used by the Local Authority to house single 21 occupancy and so I knew that we had been to that address on numerous times and there may be an increased risk 22 23 because of the people who we knew either lived there or went there. 24

25

Q. Was that information that you were aware of from your

1		local knowledge
2	A.	Yes, yes.
3	Q.	of the area? Right.
4	A.	So based on that fact I didn't want the two officers
5		arriving on their own because I believed that this
6		was had potential of being a higher risk. The only
7		other officer that was available was me, so I was going
8		to go as well, so I notified those two officers not to
9		attend the scene on their own and to pull over
10	Q.	You have said you had three constables.
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	One was single crewed.
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	Where was
15	A.	So she was currently out of our policing area backing up
16		on a rural alarm activation, so the rural area had sent
17		a single crew to a premises alarm and because they were
18		single crewed she was then going from the town to back
19		up that member of staff.
20	Q.	So you were left with two?
21	A.	I was left with two.
22	Q.	A probationer and a constable with about five years'
23		service?
24	A.	Yes.
25	Q.	Sorry.

1	Α.	I could be wrong on the length of time, but yes, so then
2		I instructed them to pull over on the way to there
3		because I knew from my own mind the location towards
4		them, where they would have to go. There was a dual
5		carriageway in one direction that they needed to travel
6		along. There was a dual carriageway with 30-mile an
7		hour limit, so I asked them to pull over and wait there
8		so we could RV.
9	Q.	Explain what RV means?
10	A.	So we could rendezvous, so it was so we could
11		rendezvous and both turn up together because I didn't
12		want just one vehicle turning up on their own.
13	Q.	And that was something that you could do as the
14		sergeant?
15	Α.	Yes, definitely, because ultimately my job was to also
16		safeguard and protect the officers' health and safety.
17		So then as I pulled up behind them we both moved off
18		and we both pulled up at the premise together. We all
19		got out of the vehicles, we walked into the front garden
20		area which was part walled so you couldn't instantly see
21		what was happening behind there and the first thing that
22		I was confronted with was the front door of the premise
23		being open, the lights were all on in the communal
24		hallway and there was a young man laid on the floor with
25		an arterial bleed from the neck which was it seemed

to be hitting the ceiling, it was really high and
 another young man then who appeared to be crouched over
 him, standing up to his feet.

4 So at that point in my mind then all of these little 5 checklists start appearing because then I'm thinking preservation of life, which is always the priority, so 6 7 we've got a casualty there who appears to have an 8 arterial bleed and this is a life and death situation, 9 we've got our only suspect on the scene, so potentially 10 here we've got a murder/attempted murder scenario, we've got potentially a knife or other weapons, we might have 11 12 other people, we might have -- so all of these things 13 are going on and I'm thinking about forensic 14 contamination then between the different people and the 15 scenes.

I instantly drew my baton which was on my left-hand side so I pulled it and racked it because there was -we were on it, there was no opportunity to conduct anything from further than where we were and I needed one of my officers to go and start life saving.

I also immediately -- so I directed the constable, the female constable to deal with the life saving, thinking then that with the probationer I would stay with him and between us we would effect the arrest of the only suspect that was at scene. I needed her to get

1 by the only suspect, so I gave him the command then to 2 move out of our way. Are you holding your hand out there? 3 Q. 4 Α. Yes. So I'm instructing him to move aside to let the 5 officer through and put his hands on his head which was tactics we used to use in the Police Support Unit, 6 7 especially with suspected firearms or weapons, you get 8 the person to get their hands to the head. So then 9 I could clearly see then there was no weapon in his

10 hands, so I asked him to move over to the side to allow 11 the officer behind and I instructed that officer to 12 start dealing with the casualty.

I instantly informed control "Urgent, ambulance
required, arterial bleed and urgent back-up required",
but I knew the closest back-up was likely to be at least
30 minutes away at another town.

17 So then I'm trying to keep distance and I'm thinking 18 about the probationer officer because I had had him 19 since he came from training school, so he had been on my 20 shift so whether I was in custody or patrol I had 21 a close working relationship with him so I instantly 22 knew this was potentially the most significant event he had been confronted with, so I was speaking to the 23 24 person but I was trying to be calm because I didn't want 25 to -- if he was an armed suspect, I didn't want him to

1 go into flee mode, as in thinking then he's got to fight his way out, so I was trying to keep everything down and 2 3 like, you know, "Keep calm, talk to me, what's happening?" And he just kept his hands up to his head. 4 5 I then informed him that I was going to send the male officer to him with handcuffs, to put handcuffs on 6 7 him and that I didn't want him to resist the officer, so 8 then he was compliant, he said "Okay", and I asked him 9 to turn away from us, keep his hands on his head and the officer was going to approach gently from behind and 10 take his right arm first. So then I indicated to the 11 12 constable to approach. He took -- he got the clip -cuff on the right hand, that got brought down and then 13 14 the next hand came down. We then took him to the van 15 and at the van we searched him -- cursory search to see if there was any weapon, couldn't find any weapon. 16

17 I'm then calling over to the constable there for any update on the injured party. She was in distress 18 because it was obvious there that this was an emergency 19 20 situation for life. I'm updating control then "Any 21 update on the ambulance?" You know, can they confirm 22 it's attending and to ensure they have told them it's a suspected arterial bleed, we haven't yet found the 23 24 weapon. We got the man into the back of the van, but now I'm conscious as well that for forensics there's me 25

1 and this male constable have now dealt with the male suspect so if we now go to the victim we could be 2 3 transferring DNA as well, so I'm trying to keep away 4 from the casualty but I'm also aware that the suspect, 5 now that he is handcuffed, needs constant supervision. Why do you say that? 6 Q. 7 Α. That's because of the risk of any form of restraint, so 8 it's general principle that -- certainly since 2006 they 9 have used the codes of level 1, 2, 3 and 4 for 10 supervision levels and level 3 is applicable to anybody who is -- once they are in restraints, because they 11 12 can't fully protect themselves, and because of the risk 13 of any medical emergency as well, so I was conscious 14 that he needed constant supervision, so we got him in 15 the van and closed the perspex door but then I told that constable he had to stay at the door and keep 16 17 observations on the suspect.

So then at that point I heard a screech of brakes 18 and a thud and turned around to see on the road a car 19 20 had ran a pedestrian over so now I've got a pedestrian 21 laid on the road and this car and I'm just thinking "Is this an inspector's promotion scenario?" So then I ran 22 over to this because again I'm thinking preservation of 23 life, my priority was is this another life and death 24 25 casualty or not because I have already got

1 a preservation of life there, plus now an enforceable 2 requirement for the suspect who has been arrested. 3 As I get over to the incident scene, the person who 4 has been hit now stands themselves up and limps to the 5 pavement, so then I'm calling up "We need a second ambulance because we have got an RTC, walking wounded", 6 7 so I tell that person to sit on the side and then 8 thinking about the priorities and at that point it 9 wasn't the NDM, the National Decision Model, it was the 10 predecessor, the conflict management model, which was basically the same thing, but then thinking about threat 11 12 and risks and priorities I then informed the car driver 13 they need to take themselves to the police station and 14 report the incident and stay there, that's because of 15 the other priorities that were going on. So you are continually, in light of new information, 16 Q. 17 feeding that into this process of considering threat and 18 risk? 19 Threat and risk. Α. 20 And priorities? Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 And you are reacting -- every time something else Q. happens, you're reacting to that and factoring that into 23 24 your decision-making process? A. Yes and then as I rushed back over to the scene of the 25

1		other going on, I was then aware of a group of young men
2		who came from that direction who had what looked like
3		baseball bats, or wood with them and one of them was
4		banging it on a wheelie bin and throwing abuse at us
5		about what they were going to do and again I'm thinking
6		"Could this get any worse?"
7		So at that point I still had the baton withdrawn
8		from earlier, I then pulled my CS as well.
9	Q.	So again you're taking account of the equipment that you
10		have available to you?
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	That's another resource as well as
13	A.	Yes and thinking about people, object, place and
14		thinking about people, there's only me who can deal with
15		this and I want to deal with it quickly and probably
16		differently than I would have done under normal
17		circumstances.
18	Q.	We have heard about some evidence about a mnemonic
19		"POP", "People, Object, Place"?
20	A.	Yes and "people" is looking at the people you're dealing
21		with, but plus the person, yourself as well, and
22		thinking about your own capabilities, how many of you is
23		there and what's your competency, so, for example, if
24		I compare myself now as a 52-year-old to when I was
25		first promoted to a sergeant at 27, at 27 I was running

1 marathons, in the gym most days, I was fit and healthy and now I'm not, so even looking at a situation now 2 3 I would be thinking, you know, I'm not going to get up 4 off the floor as quick now as I would have then, so I've 5 got to take my demographics into consideration, plus I wanted this to be dealt with so I could deal with 6 7 priority of life. 8 So when you're considering people it's not just the Q. 9 subject, it's not just members of the public, it's 10 yourself and your own skills and experience? Yes, and people's competencies and likewise then 11 Α. 12 thinking about, you know, the initial decision of 13 a probationer constable and a more experienced 14 constable, who am I going to direct to the casualty. 15 Q. So their skills and experience of members of your team? 16 Yes and that comes from knowing your team and having Α. 17 a bit of knowledge about who you've got, what experience 18 they've got, what exposure have they had already and 19 then trying the best that you can.

20 Q. Yes.

A. So thankfully this group then eventually went when they realised the severity of what was going on and then we could start dealing -- and then it took -- it was probably about 30 minutes in total before extra police officers attended but by that time the ambulance

1		had attended before any police resources attended.
2	Q.	And during this whole event you have said that you were
3		on the radio feeding back
4	Α.	Yes, constantly.
5	Q.	and is that the same
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	to ACR or the control room and would that be audible
8		to other members of the police service?
9	A.	Yes, anyone who was on that radio channel, in addition
10		to the control room, and it was trying to prioritise our
11		incident hopefully to feed back to the control room
12		because if they've got staff at other incidents, if they
13		then know what we're dealing with so they now know that
14		at this scene for three officers we've got a suspect who
15		is a suspect who is detained, a casualty who might
16		die, potentially a murder scene, an injured party from
17		a road traffic collision and a potential public order,
18		all in one, then hopefully they would prioritise us over
19		other incidents.
20	Q.	One would hope so.
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	But sharing that information on your radio, we have
23		heard evidence that that then allows the control room to
24		take steps, appropriate steps?
25	A.	Yes.

1	Q.	It allows other officers to be aware of the situation
2		and also take appropriate action.
3	A.	Yes, definitely.
4	Q.	And that's that was your experience during that
5		event?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	Thank you. And you mentioned at the beginning that you
8		RVed, or rendezvoused.
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	We have heard some evidence about the nature of
11		a rendezvous point and you have told us that you have
12		listened to Martin Graves' evidence.
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	And we heard about, you know, there can be an officer
15		with a marshal, I think he called it.
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	Are you able to help us understand the distinction
18		between that type of rendezvous point and the one you
19		described?
20	Α.	Yes, so we have basically two different types of
21		rendezvous point. One is called the RV point and one is
22		called a forward control point, so at the lowest level
23		is your RV point and that can just be a case of pulling
24		over on the side for a few seconds while somebody else
25		catches up. It's looking at it's a temporary it's

1		not permanently blocking the road that you need a Local
2		Authority permit for to do, it's a very brief "Pull
3		over, hang on until I catch up", that can be your RV
4		point.
5	Q.	Can that be organised on a spontaneous
6	A.	Absolutely, yes.
7	Q.	Is that like the scenario you described in your example
8		there?
9	Α.	Yes, and certainly with teams I have worked with I would
10		always encourage them to if there's more than one
11		patrol going hang back so that you can both turn up
12		together and plus certainly in Cumbria we weren't always
13		double crewing, so you could end up with a two and
14		a one, or two ones turning up but what I didn't want, as
15		far as possible, was just one vehicle turning up.
16	Q.	Why not?
17	Α.	Mostly one aspect is the presence, the physical
18		presence, particularly if it's a call about disorder
19		outside of clubs or pubs. If public see two vehicles
20		turning up then those who maybe don't have any intent to
21		continue disorder, just the sight of the vehicles
22		turning up they are likely to run from the scene. So
23		it's just to try and ensure that physical presence with
24		two. Or if you have then got a scenario where you have
25		got an injured party and a suspect, you've got enough

1 people to instantly deal, so I just find from an 2 operational point of view if you can get people -- if 3 that just means delaying something by a very short time, 4 it can be a more efficient and effective police 5 response, both for safety and policing priorities. So it's not just the policing priorities, it can be the 6 Q. 7 safety. Whose safety could be benefited by that 8 approach? 9 Everybody's safety can be benefited because if you've Α. 10 got then the officers, the public, the suspects that you're dealing with, by having enough staff attend 11 12 initially, it can contain people, it can stop people 13 then fleeing amongst the crowds and across other 14 publics, it can help with officer safety so that they 15 then -- if one officer turns up on their own and there's two or three offenders, especially if they're drunk, 16 17 they're more likely to feel they can challenge the officer, so that visual presence can often assist and 18 negate any trouble straight off. 19 20 But the forward control point, that was brought in 21 with the command and control training as well in

22 relation to major incidents and the command and 23 control -- sorry, the forward control point, the forward 24 control point is a more permanent RV point so it can be, 25 for example, short-term like half an hour or an hour --

there is no formal time limit with this -- or it can be weeks or days and usually then you do need marshals because you decide -- it's typically a car park or a large open hard standing and you will cordon off different parts so you will say "All police resources go there, all ambulance resources go there, Local Authority there" etc, so everyone will have an area.

There will then be established briefing sessions, 8 there will be toileting, catering, you know, everything 9 10 then will be brought to that forward control point and even from a police point of view the national riots, 11 12 when forces were sending their staff down to like 13 London, when we were -- every force was sending staff 14 down, even Cumbria we were sending staff down, there 15 would be a forward control point so you would be roads of just personnel vans parked up, that would be 16 a forward control point, so it doesn't always have to be 17 18 a car park, it can be roads that they take over.

19When we think about the ferries, when -- the20stack-up -- when they stack the lorries, "Operation21Stack", they will have one lane of the dual carriageways22allocated as basically the forward control point as well23for stacking things and for meeting.

Q. So there's both the planned rendezvous point, a moreestablished structure, if I can call it that, and then

1		you've got your more spontaneous
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	which can just be officers agreeing to meet in
4		advance and arriving en masse?
5	A.	Yes and then if that RV point became a more long-term
6		thing as part of the planning then you would be looking
7		at silver and/or bronze looking for a nominated RV
8		point, a more formalised and then it could become
9		a more formalised RV point or forward control point.
10	Q.	Thank you. I would like to ask you about something in
11		your CV which says you specialised in safer handling of
12		detained persons and safer custody
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	and the use of force.
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	Could you tell the Chair a little about that experience
17		that you have.
18	A.	Yes, so if we go back then to like the early 1990s and
19		the culture then within the police was if a person was
20		arrested they went into the cells, often without being
21		searched, they had belts on, they had property in their
22		pockets, things like death in custody wasn't really
23		considered or given priorities, often the detainees
24		weren't visited through the night. A lot of the safety
25		control measures weren't there.

1 As time evolved, and certainly from 1996, as an acting doing some custody function but then 1997 being 2 3 a custody sergeant, the cultures then were changing in relation to safer custody, safer detention. That was 4 5 then formalised. From 2002 the UK became part -- well, they signed up to the agreement to adopt safer custody 6 7 principles and that was across all of the secure sectors 8 where the person is held by the state, so that's police, 9 prison, mental health units, immigration, military 10 prisons, so --Were these European standards in relation to custody? 11 Q. 12 Α. Yes, yes. I think you mention this in your report. 13 Q. 14 Yes, so that was from 2002 voluntary, 2006 mandatory. Α. 15 So in -- between these times, certainly from the late 90s, there was a lot of change starting to happen and 16 17 The Independent Police Complaints Commission for England 18 at the time, they were conducting lots of research in relation to deaths in custody and what people were most 19 20 vulnerable, how control measures could have or should 21 have helped, examples of when it did help, so there was a lot of research going on for that sort of ten-year 22 period of time. 23

From 2006 there was a document published called the
Safer Detention and Handling of Persons in Police

1 Custody, so shorthand it was called the SDHP 2006. And was the Scottish Police Force part of that drive to 2 Q. 3 comply with the European standards? 4 Α. Well, they were part of the UK movement, but the 2006 5 SDHP was written specifically for England and Wales, but there were similar things happening throughout then 6 7 Ireland and Scotland as well, but certainly my 8 experience at the time was just in England, but it 9 took -- from 2006 it formally recognised that custody 10 began from the point of initial contact, so then from point of initial contact that would also take into 11 12 account all the issues around the NDM like what was the 13 known information, the threat, the risk, so then that 14 2006 edition was updated in 2012 as the SDHP 2012, but 15 it certainly then took everything back to that initial point of contact. So my work then, from 2006 -- because 16 17 I had been involved in custody by then for ten years, and I was qualified Home Office trainer as well, and 18 I had also done a lot of research at the time and 19 20 proposed practices that needed to change certainly 21 within Cumbria, I then became involved in the training, 22 delivery and design for implementation of change.

Now, I then designed a training course which was
then taken by the -- what was the National Police
Improvement Agency at the time. They then adapted that

1		and adopted it and then put it out as a national package
2		in order for bringing about change as quickly as
3		possible in relation to practice and that again was
4		going right back to that initial contact.
5	Q.	And that related to custody and safer custody?
6	Α.	Safer custody, yes. So commonly the umbrella term used
7		through all the different agencies was "safer custody".
8	Q.	But that package that was delivered and rolled out
9		nationally
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	that related to from the point of contact
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	between a subject and a police officer?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	So people shouldn't imagine custody is only when you're
16		in the custody cells
17	Α.	Definitely not.
18	Q.	in a police office.
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	And your training, which you delivered your training
21		package was designed to improve the standards?
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	And implement change, I think you said.
24	Α.	And the standards of the control measures.
25	Q.	And what sort of things are you thinking when you say

"control measures"? 1 2 Well, recognition of what then becomes a risk factor, so Α. 3 there are certain conditions which have constantly 4 remained identified risk factors throughout all of the 5 custody risks, that's: head injuries, alcohol intoxication, drug intoxication, mental ill health, 6 7 asthma, diabetes, angina. So those are specified risks. Recognised risks for someone in custody? 8 Q. Yes and those are particularly specifically specified as 9 Α. 10 stand-alone topics where if any of those are identified then you must obtain appropriate clinical attention as 11 12 soon as practicable. 13 So any of those risks require some sort of medical Q. 14 attention --15 Yes, yes. Α. 16 -- being given to the person? Q. Regardless of whether the police officers or the person 17 Α. 18 acknowledge there's any problem with it. 19 Right. So any of those risks, if they're recognised or Q. 20 known, require some sort of medical intervention? 21 Α. Yes and you will find now that if any of those risk 22 factors are identified, reasonable custody sergeants 23 will not book those people in. They will instantly say to the presenting officers "You must go to hospital with 24 that person first", or a lot of custody units now have 25

1 embedded healthcare professionals working and based from there, they will have the healthcare professional come 2 3 and see the person before they even start booking them 4 in. 5 Right. Can you think of any examples that you can maybe Q. share with the Chair where you have come across 6 7 a situation where someone was having a mental health 8 crisis who was in police custody? Yes. Certainly as a custody sergeant, in my early days 9 Α. 10 of custody sergeant we didn't have CCTV in the -throughout the custody, so you're up and down the 11 12 custody block checking your detainees regular and at 13 that point we didn't have detention officers neither, so 14 I used to find that once the arresting officers went it 15 was just me and all the detainees, that was it, so I had to do all of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act, all 16 17 the legal requirements as well as all of the welfare requirements for the detainees, and I had been up and 18 19 down the cell block throughout the tour of duty, it was 20 a night shift, and I happened to go back down to do the 21 regular checks and I noticed from one of the cells there 22 was some water coming from under the door, so I tried to 23 tiptoe towards the door and look through the hatch and 24 I seen the man who was inside the cell was now naked, 25 stood on the bed and the floor of the cell was wet, so

it appeared that he had blocked the toilet and caused it
 to overflow, to wet.

3 I opened the hatch and I seen that he had released 4 the lights from the ceiling and all the electrical wires 5 were hanging down now as well, so those wires were live, water on the floor, he is on the bed. By looking at him 6 7 I could instantly see he was in some form of crisis so 8 the last thing I wanted to do was create a negative 9 reaction from him and something that I was taught back 10 in 1994 -- when I did my Home Office trainer's course we were taught this philosophy of transactional analysis 11 12 about how to communicate with different people.

13 Q. Tell us about that.

14 And what it was looking at is people will always move Α. 15 between a childlike state, an adult state or an adult -sorry, childlike state, an adult state, or a critical 16 17 parent state and in child state you've got "free child", 18 you know, the happy child and this is where your happy drunk who by day they're a professional person and then 19 20 they have a few drinks, they're happy drunk, they're 21 jumping up and down, walking down the streets with cones 22 on their head, no malice but a lot of people looking at them would go "That's disorderly conduct", but they're 23 having this free child moment of having a laugh, pushing 24 25 their colleagues on the chairs down the corridors in

1

workplaces, that's the free child.

2 The alternative to that free child is the child who 3 is maybe then having -- you know, your two-year-old 4 tantrums who is very -- at that point, that moment in 5 time might be egocentric upon themselves, they need some -- they're upset, they need some instant 6 7 satisfaction in relation to something and they're very 8 much involved in their own moment of crisis and that 9 crisis could be for a whole host of issues.

10 Then at the other end you've got "parent", so you could have "nurturing parent" or "critical parent", so 11 12 as people, if they've got children, might know there are 13 times they need to go between the two different forms of 14 parent to get a response -- suitable response from the 15 child. So the idea is in order to get people functioning we need to be in adult, so if somebody is in 16 17 a childlike state, a positive way of dealing with them 18 is to go into a parent state in order to try and bring them to the adult state, so for me then faced with this, 19 20 if I saw people who appeared to be in crisis I would 21 always try and go into nurturing parent mode initially 22 because it's easier at times to escalate my response up than if you go in at critical parent, it's hard then to 23 24 turn to nurturing parent because you have lost the 25 trust.

1 Q. What does a nurturing parent do?

So this is the person who might then be going, you know, 2 Α. 3 "What's up? What do you need? Can I help you?" The 4 same as if your child was crying you would be going 5 "What do I need to do to help you, what's going to make you feel happier?" So it's that nurturing parent to try 6 7 and stop the moment of crisis. 8 What's the critical parent? Q. 9 So the critical parent will be things like "Stop doing Α. 10 that, get to your room now" and just ignoring the reason for the crisis. It's more a didactic instruction. 11 12 Q. Right, sorry. Carry on. 13 That's all right. So I used to try -- if I seen Α. 14 somebody in any form of crisis, or on the potential of 15 being in crisis, I would always try and be that nurturing parent and particularly in a cell block 16 17 environment you're dealing with a lot of people who have 18 lost their liberty, who have a whole host of different 19 crisis issues for themselves there and I used to feel it 20 was like working in a powder keg and the least spark 21 could set everything off. So I used to always find --22 as a custody sergeant I would try and be nurturing 23 parent to try and keep things as calm and smooth as possible, but then knowing if I needed to go into 24

25 critical parent, I could.

1 So seeing this situation, thinking about risk and 2 everything and the information I was receiving was I've got a person in here who is now -- they're acting 3 4 unusual, they have taken their clothes off -- usually 5 people only take their clothes off in a cell if the police have taken them off, but I now have a naked 6 7 man in the cell, he is on his bed, he is not looking 8 like you would expect a person to look, so I was 9 thinking that's an unusual look, so that could either be 10 a crisis through any mental illness, it could be a crisis through drug or drink withdrawal, it could be 11 12 anger, there could be a whole issue but I just knew this 13 wasn't the like normal state.

I wanted to be careful with this because I also knew there was electrical wires hanging from the ceiling and there was water throughout the cell and a little bit coming out from the door, so I needed to make sure I wasn't in the water.

I then instantly went into nurturing parent and I said his name and I said "How can I help you?" and at the same time I touched the silent alarm button on the wall because there was only me in the cell block and there was other detainees as well. I knew then officers would be coming because the silent alarm activates in other parts of the station and also at the area control

room so I knew then that they would also pass over the
 air to officers that the alarm had activated in the
 custody unit.

4 I'm then trying to talk to him, but I don't want him 5 to react spontaneous, I don't want him jumping off the bed in anger, so I'm just trying to say to him like 6 7 "Just stay there, let's talk about things, what's up? 8 How can I help you?" I'm trying to buy time, trying to 9 keep everything calm. As I'm hearing the officers 10 entering the custody block I've got my hand up to tell them to like stop, so then I actually said to him while 11 12 he was standing there "Can I make you a cup of tea or 13 coffee?" and he asked for a cup of tea so I said "Okay, 14 I'm going to be away for just a short time while I put 15 the kettle on, stay on the bed", so then as I pulled the hatch up and walked away I'm whispering then to the 16 17 colleagues that we need the electricity cut to that 18 cell, to disconnect that live wire. I also need 19 a shield team, I need two officers for a shield --20 three-person shield team because there's part of my 21 Police Support Unit I was trained in shield tactics, so 22 usually as the sergeant you would have your two constables in front with the shield and as the sergeant 23 you would be behind them holding their utility belts, 24 25 directing where you wanted them to go and also trying

1

then to communicate with the subject.

So I wanted that function to be available in case 2 3 I needed it, but I was hoping we could just resolve 4 this. So the officers then went -- I wasn't going to open the door. The officers went off to do what I had 5 asked them to do. I went back to the cell with the cup 6 7 of tea, but by that point I got the notification that 8 they had got the switch cut to the lights for that cell, 9 so I knew now that the power was cut, so I was able to 10 tell him that I have cut the power to the cable, 11 you know, we have had that cut so you can come and get 12 your drink.

13 He then got his drink, went back to the bed, sat 14 down, we were talking through the hatch, then after 15 a little while I said to him we could talk further and resolve things but we needed him to get out of that room 16 17 now to a dry cell and we needed him to get dressed, I would get the doctor to come out and see him, etc. He 18 19 agreed that he would come out quiet. I told him there 20 were other officers there now but as long as he was calm 21 we would just move him and those officers wouldn't get 22 involved and thankfully he came out, no problem, and went into another cell. 23

Q. You have described what you saw when you arrived in thecell. Am I right in thinking you are assessing the

1		risks as you see what's in the cell?
2	A.	Constantly, yes.
3	Q.	And it's risk to yourself
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	from the water and the electricity and risk to the
6		subject?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	There were no other members of the public around at that
9		time?
10	A.	No.
11	Q.	And you talked about buying time and keeping him calm?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	Can you explain the benefits of buying time via that
14		communication?
15	Α.	Yes. I mean one of the key ones for buying time is for
16		me as the officer and my decision-making process because
17		you've got multiple for me I'll be seeing multiple
18		lists spinning around in mid-air thinking "I've got all
19		of these" and I'm trying to think "What am I actually
20		dealing with? Am I dealing with a person in certain
21		am I dealing with a medical crisis which needs a medical
22		response? Am I dealing with a police response, as in
23		a crime, or?" You know, I don't want it to escalate
24		because it might be a medical response which if I deal
25		with wrong could turn into a crime, so all the time I'm

1 buying a bit of time, thinking time for me, I'm also 2 buying thinking time for colleagues, buying time to get 3 other colleagues in place so that we can be prepared for 4 what contingencies we might need. So with that one, for 5 example, saying about the shields, in case we needed the shield entry I wanted staff kitted up with the shields 6 7 in the cell block unit, just so that they were there and 8 ready.

9 So yes, it's buying yourself time and it's trying to 10 calm it down a bit more as well and build up that rapport and trust so that the person -- you will often 11 12 find that if you treat the person with that nurturing 13 parent side they might strongly dislike other officers 14 but they will like you and certainly as the custody 15 sergeant the amount of time that I could get -- I could get detainees who were threatening to not leave the cell 16 17 without fighting, but then if I then went down and said "Will you come with me?" they were happy to go because 18 I had already built a bit of rapport with them. 19 20 We may have heard some evidence that's dismissive of the Q. 21 idea of offering someone a cup of tea and it would 22 appear that you actually literally did offer this 23 person --I would regularly use it. Even going to see victims of 24 Α.

crime. If a person has rang and they're distressed --

25

1 because they might be distressed that, you know, 2 somebody's been and damaged their property or whatever, 3 often a line I would start with would be "Why don't you 4 make yourself a brew and then we will sit down and 5 I will take some details off you", while I'm getting my 6 kit out, you know, "You get a brew", and it was, you 7 know -- sometimes they would go "No, I don't want one", 8 but it was just that throwing it in and I would be going 9 back to that earlier training of thinking about try 10 being nurturing because it's not -- if it's not putting 11 me at risk or anyone else at risk, just that little bit 12 of compassion can then go a long way further on. So if you or anyone else is at risk, you may take 13 Q. 14 a different view?

15 Yes, so that -- that first example, for example, where Α. 16 we've got the guy who has got the arterial bleed, we were on that so quick and I needed to get officers by, 17 18 you know, that wasn't appropriate then for me to ask 19 about the cup of tea because it wasn't there, but it was 20 still appropriate, I thought, to start talking to him and ask him to move aside so that the officer could get 21 22 by, just give him that opportunity so then if he said "No I'm not moving, you have to get past me" then we 23 know where we stand, but it was just all the time "Can 24 I get as much compliance as possible before we have to 25

1 use force?"

Q. And even in that more extreme example where the man has the arterial bleed, you were seeking to communicate with the subject?

5 Yes, because I just always think that the last thing Α. I want is to start fighting with people because chances 6 7 are somebody is going to get injured and it could be one 8 person or more than one person and it could be serious 9 injuries, so it as much as possible if we can avoid the 10 use of force and violence, then we can look at minimum 11 use of force, just purely as transportation, handcuffs 12 if need be.

Thank you. You talked about, in buying time and looking 13 Q. 14 at the person you could see that this was not normal 15 behaviour and so is one of the benefits of taking that 16 extra time your opportunity to observe what's happening? I have always found that, yes. As far as possible 17 Α. 18 taking that time, just to take in as much information, 19 because otherwise you can get just focused on the person 20 and you want to gather as much information from around 21 the scene.

Q. And during that, attempts from you to communicate you have said you were speaking through the hatch? A. Yes.

25 Q. We have heard about a principle called the "CUT

principle"? 1 2 Yes. Α. 3 "Create distance, use cover, and transmit". Q. 4 Α. Yes. 5 Would the existence of the hatch be part of the "use Q. 6 cover" principle? 7 Α. Yes, so I was keeping the door closed. There was no way 8 I was opening that door because that was my cover 9 because otherwise I could be fearful of "Do I get 10 dragged in?" and then it's a hostage scene, I'm now in amongst water and electricity and -- so I would 11 12 certainly want to keep that hatch there unless there's 13 other members in. And does that protect your own safety? 14 Q. 15 Α. Yes, but then opening the hatch allows me to look at the 16 person and for them to see me because although I could 17 see them through the little eye glass, it's not good 18 communicating to someone if all they can do is hear a voice so I wanted them to see my face and to try and 19 20 reassure them that I was no threat to them, I wanted to 21 help them and I wanted it to end peacefully rather than 22 not. 23 And to what extent are you also using your body Q. language, your demeanour, your tone of voice to 24 25 communicate?

1 Α. Yes, I mean the majority of communication is non-verbal, 2 such as your body language and the tone of voice, so as 3 much as possible keeping your body as relaxed as you can 4 and open-handed and, you know, like this kind of thing 5 (indicating) rather than hands on hips and finger wagging that would be transmitting the critical parent. 6 7 So as much as possible it's relaxed, it's standing back, 8 it's looking, it's saying to the person "Talk to me, 9 I want to talk to you", showing my hands towards the 10 hatch so not putting them in the hatch but lifting them up towards the hatch and saying "Talk to me, I'm here to 11 12 help you." 13 As we speak now you're keeping eye contact as well? Q. 14 Α. Yes. 15 Is that another important factor? Q. 16 Yes, because you want to keep your eye on the person as Α. 17 well to watch for changes and you're trying to read the 18 person, you're trying to read their face and if, for 19 example, you're dealing with someone on the street and 20 you're keeping the distance, theory would have it if you 21 kept looking towards that door while we're talking then I need to be thinking "You're planning your escape 22 through that door". 23 Right. 24 Q.

25 A. So -- because often with people their body language will

1		indicate in the short-term what they're going to do.
2	Q.	So that period of observation again is about gathering
3		in information for yourself?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	And then during your description of those events you
6		seem to be indicating you were sharing quite a lot of
7		information with the man in the cell about what was
8		happening?
9	A.	Very much, to keep him informed of what the noises were,
10		for example, because what I don't want to do is
11		pressurise someone into thinking that I'm being devious,
12		or for them to think that we're planning an attack, so
13		I would be saying "Officers are coming in now because
14		they're but they're waiting down at the bottom of the
15		cell, the cell area. I've got four officers down
16		there", so I wouldn't hide that information from them
17		and just trying to again it's just about that trust
18		and rapport.
19	Q.	And you were in the first example you gave us in
20		the the man with the arterial bleed, you described
21		being on the radio a lot.
22	A.	Yes.
23	Q.	And sharing information with the control room and other
24		officers?
25	A.	Yes.

1 Q. On this occasion you didn't really mention your use of 2 your radio to that extent. 3 Α. Mm-hm. 4 Q. How were you communicating with others? 5 Well, they could all hear because initially -- the Α. initial communication was through the silent alarm 6 7 which -- there was always a silent alarm within --8 that's why I'm demonstrating. If I was at the hatch 9 there's always a silent alarm button on the wall next to 10 a cell door, so that was my first communication. Although I had a radio on me, the noise within the 11 12 cell blocks because it's all metal and stone, everything 13 echos and if a person then is in crisis that is causing 14 a lot more noise and commotion and it can then stop the 15 communication if they're hearing all of this noise going on, this white noise, that can take over me being able 16 17 to talk, so basic issues we're taught when we're dealing 18 with people when who are in crisis is to knock your 19 radio right down as far as you can, so it's still live 20 so you can communicate but you have knocked it right 21 down so you're not having all of this noise blaring. 22 So, is it fair to say you were tailoring your methods Q. 23 and style of communication to the particular circumstances --24

25 A. Yes.

-- that faced you at that time? 1 Q. 2 Α. Yes. 3 Thank you. I would like to ask you some questions now Q. 4 about your experience as an expert. I could probably go 5 through that quite quickly if that's fine. 6 Α. Okay. 7 Q. Could we look please at one of the passages in your 8 report please, paragraph 3.2. Sorry, that's page 18. 9 Do I see you have been engaged -- sorry, if you can just 10 come down the page: 11 "I have been engaged for approximately 150 case 12 reports over the last 5 years concerning deaths or injures in custody, police custody procedures and use of 13 14 force within all of the secure custody sectors." 15 Α. Yes. You also are contactable through email and give advice 16 Q. 17 that way as well. 18 Α. Yes. 19 And you say that you provided reports for misconduct Q. 20 cases. 21 Α. Yes. Is that against the police? 22 Q. 23 Α. Yes. Q. Is that for both the police officers or the 24 25 police service?

1	A.	Both. In relation to misconduct, the Police Federation
2		of England and Wales legal teams have engaged me.
3		I have also been engaged by the professional standards
4		departments and I have been engaged by the IPCC, as was,
5		which is now the IOPC, the Independent Office of Police
6		Conduct.
7	Q.	And you say coroner inquiries?
8	Α.	Coroner in addition to that other one, the Police
9		Ombudsman for Northern Ireland have also engaged me.
10		Yes, so coroners' inquiries, I have been engaged
11		directly by them.
12	Q.	Fatal accident inquiries in Scotland?
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	Civil and criminal cases?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	And you have given evidence on a number of occasions in
17		relation to these reports?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	And then do we see the split of your cases in this
20		paragraph when you have been called as an expert for the
21		defence, that's roughly 38% of your work?
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	Is this over the past five years?
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	And then you have been called by either the prosecuting

1		authority or the claimant 56% of the time?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	And you have been engaged directly by the coroner 6% of
4		the time?
5	Α.	Yes.
6	Q.	And now you can add that you have been instructed by
7		a Public Inquiry.
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	Thank you. You have delivered many training courses for
10		participants
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	over since you have left the Police Force.
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	How many courses or how many participants have you
15		trained?
16	Α.	So since January 2014 until the end of 2021 I have
17		electronically registered 10,800 and something delegates
18		and that's mostly between conflict management, use of
19		force, managing behaviour, or first aid. Those are the
20		predominant courses. Then on top of that there's been
21		the odd child protection course, but the majority of
22		those are either the first aid or to deal with the
23		challenging behaviour.
24	Q.	And am I right in thinking that your cases that you have

been involved with as a skilled witness, or as an expert

25

1		have been all over the UK: England, Wales, Scotland,
2		Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland and the Isle
3		of Man?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	And they have been criminal and civil?
6	A.	Criminal and civil, yes.
7	Q.	Yes. And you have acted for members of you have been
8		instructed, I should have said, by family members?
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	Or by professional standards?
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	Or in relation to those matters too. And you are
13		aware of your obligations as a skilled witness, as an
14		expert, that you're actually here to assist the Chair
15	A.	Yes, yes.
16	Q.	and the Assessors here today?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	And you are to be objective and unbiased?
19	Α.	Yes, yes.
20	Q.	Thank you. And we had briefly touched on the fact that
21		in England there's a section of rules called "Part 35"
22		which sets out the obligations, you are aware of that as
23		well?
24	Α.	Yes.
25	MS	GRAHAME: Thank you. I'm going to move on to the

1	instruction by the Inquiry now and I wonder if it would
2	be a suitable
3	LORD BRACADALE: That would be a convenient point to take
4	a break. We will take a 20-minute break at this point.
5	MS GRAHAME: Thank you.
6	(11.21 am)
7	(Short Break)
8	(11.43 am)
9	LORD BRACADALE: Yes, Ms Grahame.
10	MS GRAHAME: Thank you.
11	I would like now to turn to the letters of
12	instruction you were sent
13	A. Yes.
14	Q from the Inquiry team, and can we look at SBPI00166
15	and 00164. We will start with 166, please.
16	And you will see this is a letter of instruction
17	dated Tuesday 12 July this year, addressed to you and
18	I'm not going to take you through the detail of this,
19	it's available for the Chair should he wish to consider
20	it, but I would like to look at a section where we
21	discuss a hypothetical, reasonable officer. Sorry,
22	I have not noted which page it is on, I'm sorry. If we
23	can scan down the page. There we are. Thank you,
24	page 6, thank you.
25	You will see that this indicates that we were

1 inviting you to consider a concept as a hypothetical 2 reasonable officer. 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. And to consider that such an officer, his acts or her 5 acts and omissions would fall to be assessed by the Chair and is that of an officer acting in accordance 6 7 with the law, their training, standard operating 8 procedures, ethical obligations and any other guidance available to them. So this is a hypothetical person --9 10 Α. Yes. -- who complies with the rules and regulations that are 11 Q. 12 on police officers --13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. -- in their actions. And we then go on to mention 15 a number of legal principles, I will come back to those 16 later. Are you comfortable in proceeding on the basis 17 that when I ask you questions, Ms Caffrey, if you would 18 consider them from the perspective of a reasonable 19 officer? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. Thank you. And we know that -- we have heard evidence 22 that a reasonable officer will only use force that is 23 reasonable, proportionate and the minimum force necessary. Do you understand that? 24 Yes. 25 Α.

1	Q.	And that there is a principle of preclusion on
2		police officers which dictates that less forceful
3		options must have been attempted and failed, or have
4		been considered and found to be inappropriate in the
5		circumstances.
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	And you understand that principle?
8	Α.	Yes, yes.
9	Q.	Thank you. We have also heard that in any given set of
10		circumstances, that there can be a range of reasonable
11		options open to any one officer.
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	There's not necessarily always one right thing to do and
14		the officers have a certain element of discretion?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	And that would be based on what they can see, what they
17		can hear, the circumstances that they find themselves
18		in.
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	And that two officers confronted with the same set of
21		circumstances may react differently, they may select
22		different force options, each of which they perceive to
23		be appropriate and reasonable.
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	And you accept that that's the case?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	And also that it is for each officer to justify their
3		own individual course of action?
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	Do you accept that?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	And also that it will be a matter for the Chair to
8		decide what the circumstances were?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And what and whether any justification offered was
11		a reasonable justification?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	Thank you. I would like to just briefly look at the
14		second letter of instruction, just for completeness,
15		which is SBPI00164, and this was a subsequent letter of
16		instruction from 22 September 2022. This expanded the
17		questions we invited you to consider
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	to include the initial management of the events
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	from the moment the calls emergency calls were
22		coming in.
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	Thank you. And you have certainly you have looked at
25		all of these issues as part of the body of your report?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	Thank you. Right. I would like to begin by focusing on
3		the events from the calls coming in, up to the point the
4		officers are about to arrive but haven't yet arrived at
5		Hayfield Road
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	and arrived at the scene. So I would like to ask you
8		about a scenario which I will give you and then I am
9		going to ask some questions about how a reasonable
10		officer would
11	Α.	Okay.
12	Q.	act in that situation. So the scenario is that
13		within around eight minutes, six calls six emergency
14		calls had been received, one member of the public has
15		called twice. That information has been taken during
16		the course of those calls by a number of call-takers in
17		the control room and noted down on the system, the
18		computer system available?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	And that information includes that an African looking
21		male was chasing a complainer's car, the complainer
22		being the member of the public who is phoning. He
23		thought he thinks he may be carrying a knife, he is
24		big with muscles, about 6-foot, wearing a white T-shirt
25		and dark coloured jeans and the male is jumping in front

1		of other cars and stopping them and that the male and
2		within a minute of that description, a male in
3		possession of a large knife, black male, wearing a white
4		T-shirt, no jacket, walking along the street with
5		a large knife in his right-hand, about a 9-inch blade
6		and walking in the direction of the hospital, walking
7		quickly, and a male, large, 6 feet tall, large knife,
8		wearing white T-shirt, walking in the direction of the
9		hospital, male in the middle of the road and that was
10		a grade 1 call
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	which we have heard is an immediate threat to life
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	and it's a high risk.
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	You recognise that category?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	And that that information is then put on to the STORM
19		log and in doing so, that then comes to the attention of
20		a controller in a control room.
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	Because of the grade 1 nature of that call it flashes
23		red and that is immediately on the same screen as the
24		controller, but also on their sergeant, their
25		superior's their supervisor's screen and also appears

1 flashing red at the same time on the duty inspector's 2 screen --3 Α. Yes. 4 -- in the ACR. So that is the scenario. Thinking about Q. 5 the control room staff and primarily, first of all, the controller, thinking about a reasonable officer in that 6 7 position, how long would you envisage that that 8 controller would take to respond or react to that grade 1 call on the computer screen? 9 10 Α. It would depend on the initial -- because every person who is involved needs to conduct some initial risk 11 12 assessment process and the National Decision-Making 13 Model is the core model that's used throughout the UK, 14 because different people could perhaps interpret risk 15 and threat slightly different as well and about policies 16 and options, so certainly such a thing coming in, the 17 keywords for me are things like "9-inch knife". Multiple 18 reports, so it's sort of making it more realistic that 19 there's multiple individuals, so each one is 20 corroborating the other report that's coming in. "Male 21 with big muscles", so there you could be thinking about, 22 well, this is potentially a strong male, 9-inch knife, risk to death of officers attending, in addition to 23 risks of death to public and also risk of death to the 24 person themselves, so it's definitely -- on that first 25

1 hearing this is a -- it's above business as usual, it's 2 not your normal routine-sounding call. 3 Usually routine-sounding calls where knives or 4 weapons are involved might be one call made saying 5 "There's some people fighting, squaring up to one another, I think someone might have a knife", and it's 6 7 a one-off call, and then you have the other extreme 8 where you say, "I'm watching someone now shooting 9 members of the public with a gun", and there's 10 everything in-between that, so certainly it's in this unusual/suspected, but it's definitely a high risk to 11 12 either officers attending -- because if you're thinking 13 about 9 inches, you don't really want to be having to 14 confront someone with a 9-inch blade because even with 15 your protective equipment you could still get stabbed 16 and killed. Q. So we have heard some evidence that officers viewed that 17 18 as a high risk incident --19 Α. Yes. -- it sounds like you would agree? 20 Q. I would, yes. 21 Α. 22 And we have also heard that the nature of there being Q. 23 multiple calls -- some evidence we have heard is that 24 some calls can be malicious or not true? 25 A. Yes.

1	Q.	But with there being multiple calls from different
2		sources, different members of the public, that gave an
3		aura of authenticity and truthfulness?
4	A.	Yes, that would enhance the reality of it and
5		truthfulness, yes.
6	Q.	And to what extent if I tell you that these calls are
7		coming in at from 7.10 on a Sunday morning, what
8		comment would you have to make about that?
9	Α.	Sunday mornings, really the mindset when you go to work
10		on a Sunday morning is that it's usually quiet, you're
11		picking up work from the night shift in relation to
12		it's more the investigative strategy and dealing with
13		prisoners who have been in overnight. You don't usually
14		get public order or violence to that level on a morning
15		shift.
16	Q.	So to what extent would the timing of the calls have
17		caused you any
18	Α.	That would indicate it's highly unusual.
19	Q.	And we have also heard some evidence about this not
20		being a call about two men fighting in a location, that
21		there's no one that's being fought with
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	or no one that's bearing the brunt of any aggression;
24		again, what difference does that make?
25	Α.	Because of its unusualness. You're identifying then

we've got a mobile -- we have potentially got a mobile armed suspect for a criminal side, or we've got a mobile armed suspect for medical help but we've got a person on the move and so it's not in a confined place, so that in itself is a logistical problem about how do you find the person, identify them and contain them in an open place where they're on the move.

Q. With logistical problems such as that, what would
a reasonable officer be considering at that stage?
A. More staff, but the best police resource for dealing
with a mobile threat is the police dog.

12 Q. Why do you say that?

Having seen them perform on numerous occasions and at 13 Α. 14 times co-trained with them, because as a public order 15 sergeant you would often combine your public order 16 training with the police dogs as well because then it helps develop the dogs dealing with the disorder and the 17 chaos that's going along, but you can see the dog can 18 easily do the work of numerous officers and it's much 19 20 safer because a lot of the members of the public, as 21 soon as a dog arrives on the scene, straight off you 22 will get a proportion of the public who will say 23 "I don't want to be here if the dog is getting let out", and suspects, at times, as soon as they see the dog, 24 they will just go to their knees and they will put their 25

1		hands up because they don't want to deal with the dog
2		and then it stops all of that physical contact being
3		at risk with the officers.
4	Q.	We have heard some evidence, as you know, from PC Wood,
5		the dog handler, that just the very presence of the dog
6		can provoke reactions in people?
7	A.	Yes, very much so.
8	Q.	You have seen that yourself?
9	A.	Yes, yes. And they're excellent if you have then got
10		a mobile suspect who runs, the police officers aren't
11		always very good at running after the people because
12		that person's hyped up, they're going a lot faster. The
13		officers have got all the different kit on, it's heavy
14		to be running with. The dog can just run after someone
15		really quick, they can contain them, they can stop them
16		from going towards member of the public and that's
17		another risk at times that if you can't contain the
18		person efficiently, you're dispersing the risk, and if
19		you're dispersing a person who is already in an agitated
20		state, that can increase the risk to the public. It
21		could push them to take, for example, a hostage, or to
22		do something to a member of the public in order to try
23		and effect their escape.
24	Q.	And when you use the word "contain", what is it you mean

25

by that word?

1 Α. To control their ability to leave, so you can contain them in an environment by having a circle of officers 2 around them so that you can try and manage and contain 3 4 them and keep the public away as well so it's not just 5 one way, you're looking at it both ways. You don't want members of the public becoming involved and you don't 6 7 want the person having freedom of movement, so it's not 8 a restrain, it's a contain.

9 Q. Right. To what extent would a reasonable officer in the 10 position of a controller receiving this information, as 11 I have described to you, to what extent would they 12 consider the need for specialist resources and by that 13 I mean ARV or dogs?

A. I think it should be a primary thought of the reasonable
 controller, thinking that --

16 Q. Why do you say that?

Because potentially -- we've got an incident which on 17 Α. 18 the description a control room inspector may decide to deem it a firearms incident, so we've got that period of 19 20 thinking it's not a normal event, so it could be 21 a suspected firearms incident, but without it even being 22 a firearms incident, it's still a high risk because of 23 the factors of the person, the object and the place that are being mentioned, so certainly I would expect 24 a controller to be seeking supervision advice at the 25

1		very least in relation to putting it up the scale.
2	Q.	Now, you said at the very least seeking supervision
3		advice?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	What does that mean in real terms? What would
6		a reasonable controller be doing?
7	A.	So your controllers typically are either constables or
8		civilian equivalent, and then control rooms will also
9		have supervisors within the teams as well, which will
10		either be sergeants or civilian equivalents, and they're
11		your mid-way point between the controller and the
12		inspector, so at the very least you've got a supervisor
13		of a sergeant or civilian equivalent to turn to for
14		advice.
15	Q.	If in this situation we have heard that there's a red
16		flash on the screen when a grade 1 call, or grade 1
17		calls come in, would a reasonable controller in that
18		situation be comfortable in assuming that the sergeant
19		and the inspector also have that on their screen?
20	A.	No, you must never assume anything within the police.
21		There's the old phrase about assuming making an ass of
22		you and me. It's all based on facts and evidence and
23		using that NDM to justify, and so you can never assume
24		that somebody is aware of a fact, because they might not
25		be.

Q. How could a controller draw attention to the matter - draw their attention to -- the sergeant's attention or
 the inspector?

4 Α. What I have seen happening for real in the Cumbria 5 control room -- it's a similar set up, you have an area 6 control room, an inspector's overview desk, you've got 7 supervisors within and then you've got your call 8 handlers within circles. The call handler then if they 9 get anything which is not business as usual they will 10 instantly be waving their hand for the supervisor to go over and the supervisor is on their shoulder within 11 12 seconds looking at what they've got.

Usually then because it's not a business as usual,
that controller is allocated as a SPOC, which is
a single point of contact.

16 Q. SPOC, S-P-O-C?

Yes, S-P-O-C, single point of contact, because you don't 17 Α. 18 want multiple people involved in the one incident whilst it's getting first assessed, but neither do you want 19 20 that one person being distracted by other incidents, so 21 once the supervisor then nominates that this person is 22 dealing with this incident, so anything else coming in 23 about this incident comes through the SPOC, and likewise 24 in our control room the inspector's overview is actually 25 in the same room, it was further across, but they could

1		also see the waving of the arms, but you would tend to
2		see the person would either wave, stand up and wave, and
3		the more worried they were, the more they would be
4		jumping up and down and waving.
5	Q.	Right. What other means would there be to communicate
6		with the supervisors in a control room? Obviously you
7		have described in Cumbria
8	A.	Yes, so you've got visual, you've got voice, vocal that
9		you can shout to them. Control room staff, if they're
10		going as in the supervision, if they're going out of
11		the room they will typically carry an Airwave terminal
12		with them so there's mechanical means of communication
13		as well as the verbal.
14	Q.	Is that when you talk about an Airwaves terminal, is
15		that like a police radio?
16	A.	A radio, yes.
17	Q.	And we may have heard some evidence that in the ACR in
18		Bilston Glen there was a tannoy system?
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	Is that the alternative?
21	A.	And that's another option, yes.
22	Q.	Right. Would it be within the range of reasonable
23		options in this scenario for a controller to send one
24		unit?
25	A.	I wouldn't think that was reasonable for a risk that's

1

above business as usual.

2 Right. So what would you think would be a reasonable Q. 3 response for a reasonable controller in that situation? 4 Α. Well, definitely because of the knife implication and 5 multiple call-ins, you need that controller -- before they even dispatch anyone -- having supervision input so 6 7 I'm aware the Scotland SOP in relation to if it's 8 a suspected firearms you must immediately refer it to 9 the --

10 Q. I will come on to that in a moment.

Yes. But certainly you want that person giving out the 11 Α. 12 "Keep safe" message and if they're deploying people it's 13 in relation to: do not intervene and it's about visuals 14 only to feed back more intelligence in relation to: do 15 we have what we're getting informed of, but you don't really want just two officers turning up. 16

17 Now, at times if every other officer was engaged on 18 a higher priority incident then you're maybe just left 19 with what you're left with and those are the risks of 20 policing, but that's where you go through the National 21 Decision-Making Model to think: this is the level of 22 risk, the control measures around this are to send sufficient numbers of staff who are competent of dealing 23 with it with the sufficient control measures around 24 25 numbers, back up, capabilities, instructions.

1 Q. Right. Can I go over some of this in a little bit more 2 detail? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. You have said you might just be left with two officers; 5 is that similar to the example you gave us earlier this 6 morning where you had a probationer and a female officer 7 had five years? 8 Α. Yes. That was the extent of your team? 9 Q. 10 Α. Yes, and we didn't know it was a knife incident, but if it was a knife incident then I still wouldn't be happy 11 12 with us just turning up like that, without tactical 13 decisions being made before we got there: where was the 14 dog handler, how far away, where was the armed response 15 vehicle. I still wouldn't be happy just three of us 16 turning up at an arterial stabbing because then you know 17 if a person's done that they've got the means and intent 18 to carry on, so again, it's looking at that balancing up 19 the risk that if it they have already stabbed and 20 potentially killed one person, the term cannon fodder, 21 you know, are we then just going in as cannon fodder and 22 at the end of the day although police officers always go 23 to work knowing that at some point they may have to put their life on the line, you don't actually expect to 24 25 have to be pushed into that role --

1	Q.	Unnecessarily.
2	A.	unnecessarily when control measures do exist that can
3		negate that.
4	Q.	Right. So a reasonable controller listening to the
5		or being aware from the screen of these calls, having
6		the capacity to listen to messages on the radio,
7		a reasonable controller would not simply send two
8	A.	No.
9	Q.	individuals.
10	A.	No, I don't believe so.
11	Q.	And would it make any difference to know if one of them
12		was a probationer, or an officer with little a short
13		period of experience in a response team?
14	A.	That would just increase the risk more because then you
15		would be thinking what level of experience have they
16		got, but even if you knew the two officers going, both
17		had a background history of police support units where
18		they have trained for shields and that, you would still
19		think it's still not it can be safer and you still
20		need to look at safety being a critical factor for the
21		deployment. It's still not safe to send two officers,
22		then if the background is the probationers and they've
23		got little experience, that just then increases that
24		risk even more.
25	Q.	You have talked about control measures to be put in

1		place.
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	Is this to protect safety of the officers?
4	Α.	It's to protect safety of the officers as well as safety
5		of the suspect that they might be dealing with as well,
6		because if you're too quick to get involved then you
7		might not then be taking into consideration all of the
8		implications that affect the safe custody and it might
9		end up not being a police custody issue, it might be
10		a medical issue.
11	Q.	Would it also include safety to potential members of the
12		public?
13	Α.	Absolutely, yes, because as I mentioned before the last
14		thing you want to do is go in with good intentions but
15		push the person into then running and taking a member of
16		the public hostage or transferring that risk to the
17		public.
18	Q.	And you talked about control measures, including
19		I think I got this in sufficient numbers of
20		police officers or staff as you put it?
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	Back-up, capabilities and instructions.
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	Can you give us a little more information?
25	A.	Well, the primary focus for dealing with any kind of

bladed weapon is contain rather than restrain, so to put a containment on you need more than two people. You can't contain someone in an open space with two, so that's the first thing there. If we're going to attempt containment, we need more than two. So if four or six turned up together, you've got a really good chance of a containment.

What was the next bit, sorry?

Sorry, you had said sufficient staff numbers, back-up 9 Q. 10 capabilities and instructions were control measures. Yes, so you need to know what back-up you've got or 11 Α. 12 specialist resources, because if the dog was near to or 13 it was only a matter of short time behind you might 14 decide then hold everyone back and let the dog go first, 15 but if you know the nearest dog is an hour away, then that's going to impact on can this wait or not, so it's 16 17 looking at your specialist resources which would include dog, ARV, your PSUs, if there's a PSU on in the policing 18 area as well, that will all impact then on do these 19 20 people need to go in or not. Is there a member of the 21 public actually at risk, because we often talk about the 22 hypothetical member of the public which is to be taken into consideration but shouldn't then be the 23 justification, because if your members of staff then get 24 25 killed, then -- but the risk to a member of the public

1		wasn't there, it was hypothetical, balancing the risk
2		then where you've got dead officers when there was
3		actually no member of the public anywhere near, so all
4		the time you have to be balancing this up.
5	Q.	So again, it's the actual circumstances on the ground
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	which
8	A.	And each time it's going to be different.
9	Q.	Yes. Then you talked about a keep safe message being
10		given.
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	Can you explain to us what you would expect a reasonable
13		controller to be doing?
14	A.	So keep safe messages they should always be part of
15		your annual refresher training for the use of force as
16		well, but it's all about being clear with any message as
17		well, and when you're thinking about when officers
18		are responding and travelling somewhere and they're in
19		the vehicles, there's a lot of noise, there's the white
20		noise of everything going on, there's the metal cages
21		rattling, there's traffic, the officers' radios are
22		going, so there's a lot of noise and white noise to be
23		dealt with, and messages that are coming over need to be
24		clear and short because there's theories about how many
25		words we can actually hear when we're in a heightened

1		state, and you're looking at three or four words per go
2		in order to get words over, so things like "Do not
3		approach", gap, "Observations only", you know, so it's
4		those "Keep safe" because you don't want the officers
5		actually getting close and you're trying to remind them
6		of the health and safety implications of their response,
7		but re-emphasising the tactic option is you're deploying
8		for observation and feedback so a tactical plan can be
9		decided.
10	Q.	To give the officers time to consider the plan?
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	Right. And you said would feedback be part of that
13		stay safe message?
14	A.	Yes, definitely. It's observe, feed back.
15	Q.	And we have heard that officers are trained to do this,
16		but a stay safe message is effectively a reminder.
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	Would you agree with that?
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	If a controller is receiving information in the scenario
21		I have given you, and is in the situation where it's
22		a grade 1 call, immediate threat to life, you have
23		described how your view is that a reasonable controller
24		would be seeking to make contact or draw it to the
25		attention of a supervisor.

1 A. Yes.

2	Q.	If that supervisor is I would like to ask you about
3		if that supervisor is absent from their station, if
4		I can call it that, their position. Are there
5		circumstances where it is reasonable for a sergeant in
6		a control room to be absent from their position?
7	Α.	If they're going to the bathroom, for example, they're
8		going to leave, but that's why you have multiple
9		supervisors and you have deputies, so that there should
10		always be as a function, there should always be
11		controller, supervisor, incident manager, as in the ACR
12		inspector. Those three functions should be available
13		24/7 as a basic command and control police response.
14	Q.	And where one or other is absent from their position,
15		what would the reasonable member of staff in the ACR
16		what arrangements would they make to have their position
17		covered during that period of absence?
18	Α.	So usually you would find where there's teams like that,
19		one person going would say "I'm just going to the loo,
20		can you watch my team", you know, "I will be back in
21		five minutes", or so there will always be that
22		notification to one another to say, "I'm just popping
23		out, I'm just popping to here", so that people knew you
24		were away from your desk and then when you come back you
25		go, "I'm back", to make sure they know that you're back.

1	Q.	So you would let people know when you're away?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	So that cover can be put in place immediately?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	And when you return, so they can stop doing that task?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	Thank you. And are there circumstances well, let me
8		look for a moment at the armed policing operations SOP
9		2014, which is PS10985. Now, you will see on the screen
10		it says "Armed Policing Operations. Standard Operating
11		procedures", and we have heard some people call this
12		a firearms SOP?
13	7	
10	Α.	Yes.
14	A. Q.	And is it commonly known as that?
14	Q.	And is it commonly known as that?
14 15	Q.	And is it commonly known as that? Yes, so you will commonly shorten it to firearms SOP,
14 15 16	Q. A.	And is it commonly known as that? Yes, so you will commonly shorten it to firearms SOP, dog SOP, custody SOP.
14 15 16 17	Q. A.	And is it commonly known as that? Yes, so you will commonly shorten it to firearms SOP, dog SOP, custody SOP. Right. And can we look please at section 1.2 on page 5,
14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	And is it commonly known as that? Yes, so you will commonly shorten it to firearms SOP, dog SOP, custody SOP. Right. And can we look please at section 1.2 on page 5, and you will see there on the screen "Purpose", 1.2:
14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	<pre>And is it commonly known as that? Yes, so you will commonly shorten it to firearms SOP, dog SOP, custody SOP. Right. And can we look please at section 1.2 on page 5, and you will see there on the screen "Purpose", 1.2: "Whilst a policy of 'Contain and Negotiate' may be</pre>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	<pre>And is it commonly known as that? Yes, so you will commonly shorten it to firearms SOP, dog SOP, custody SOP. Right. And can we look please at section 1.2 on page 5, and you will see there on the screen "Purpose", 1.2: "Whilst a policy of 'Contain and Negotiate' may be a preferred response to many firearms incidents, it</pre>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	And is it commonly known as that? Yes, so you will commonly shorten it to firearms SOP, dog SOP, custody SOP. Right. And can we look please at section 1.2 on page 5, and you will see there on the screen "Purpose", 1.2: "Whilst a policy of 'Contain and Negotiate' may be a preferred response to many firearms incidents, it should be clearly understood that there is no single
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	And is it commonly known as that? Yes, so you will commonly shorten it to firearms SOP, dog SOP, custody SOP. Right. And can we look please at section 1.2 on page 5, and you will see there on the screen "Purpose", 1.2: "Whilst a policy of 'Contain and Negotiate' may be a preferred response to many firearms incidents, it should be clearly understood that there is no single policy or tactic contained within the APP (AP) or

1		of threat that may be anticipated or encountered."
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	Are you able to explain what that means?
4	Α.	So what that's saying there is that would be the
5		preferred option
6	Q.	Contain and negotiate?
7	Α.	Yes, unless you can show why it wasn't.
8	Q.	Right.
9	Α.	So it's like with a lot of the guidance, it's the
10		preferred option unless you can justify why it wasn't,
11		so it may be I wouldn't even say if they had a hold
12		of someone because the last thing you want to do is try
13		and grab hold of someone who has already got like
14		a hostage, because even that one you would be wanting to
15		contain and back off and bring in professional
16		negotiators in order to deal with that person but yes,
17		that's the preferred unless something so just
18		thinking there, if the person then dropped their weapon
19		and they were seen to drop their weapon and then they're
20		fumbling, you might then think "I'm taking my
21		opportunity" and go for them, but if the person is
22		holding a weapon or you believe they've got access to
23		a weapon but you can't actually see it, then the
24		preference would still be contain and negotiate where
25		possible.

1	Q.	And that's an option that's available to individual
2		officers
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	in the course of their duties?
5	Α.	Yes.
6	Q.	And can we look to page 10 now, please, paragraph 8.4.
7		You will see this says "Spontaneous Firearms Incidents",
8		8.4.1:
9		"A Spontaneous Firearms Incident can be described
10		as:
11		"An incident that takes place without warning, the
12		circumstances of which demand that armed support to the
13		initial police response must be considered."
14		So "considered". And then:
15		"It should be borne in mind that this may include
16		situations where the subject is not in possession of
17		a firearm or other potentially lethal weapon but is
18		'otherwise so dangerous' that the deployment of police
19		firearms resources may be required to safely control the
20		situation eg in some situations where persons are in
21		possession of edged weapons, hostage situations etc."
22		Now, it may be that we have heard some confusion, or
23		there may be some potential confusion that this SOP is
24		all about guns and firearms. Can you explain what
25		a spontaneous firearms incident can include?

1 Α. Yes. So it can include reports of a knife of any 2 description. Typically the larger the knife, the more 3 likely it is to activate the SOP, but it could be 4 a penknife, if the behaviour of the person with it is 5 such, because you've got your sharp objects from a penknife up to a machete or a big scythe or something 6 7 and everything in-between there, but it's that call 8 coming in saying that somebody is now going down the 9 street and stabbing people, or somebody is on a train 10 going down the train stabbing people in their seats, you know, there's not a gun, but it's still a -- it 11 12 would still be classed as a firearms incident and I know 13 previous witnesses mentioned about bow and arrows, all 14 of that would fit in as well. Any lethal weapon, so any 15 sharp weapon, any lethal weapon that could kill 16 a person. And that would include a large knife --17 Q. 18 Α. Yes. 19 -- a 9-inch blade? Q. 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. Would they have to be stabbing somebody? 22 Α. No. -- for this -- to come under this definition? 23 Q. No, no. If you just think that because of the 24 Α. 25 circumstances of the item and/or the circumstances of

1		the incident as well as the item, it's considered to be
2		too dangerous to send officers in.
3	Q.	Unarmed officers?
4	Α.	Yes. So the person with the big machete, you know, it's
5		going to be nearly as long as a police baton and it's
6		not really ideal to send a police officer in with
7		a baton against a machete, so straight off you say
8		"That's a firearms incident". The person then with
9		a 9-inch blade, it could be a kitchen knife, it could be
10		a machete, you don't know until you get to see, but
11		9 inches can still kill a person with one stab.
12	Q.	And it says there on the second bullet point it can be
13		a firearm or a potentially lethal weapon, but a knife is
14		a potentially lethal weapon?
15	A.	Yes, yes.
16	Q.	And it says:
17		" otherwise so dangerous that the deployment of
18		police firearms resources may be required to safely
19		control the situation."
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	So in fact is it possible that someone even without
22		a weapon could fall within this SOP?
23	Α.	Yes, yes, they could. If it was considered that they
24		were too dangerous to deal with and that's because of
25		the fact the firearms officers also have the taser.

1 Q. And that would be based on what? What would that assessment of "otherwise so dangerous" amount to? 2 So it's all the information coming in. They may be 3 Α. 4 throwing items of risk at people where you can't 5 actually get near them and so the tactical option could be to instruct firearms, the ARV response, because it's 6 7 otherwise too dangerous to send officers in to them. Thank you. Could we look at page 12, please. I would 8 Q. 9 like to look at section 9 now, beginning with 9.4. This 10 may be going back to what you said earlier: "On receipt of a suspected firearms incident the 11 12 Controller will immediately alert the Initial Tactical Firearms Commander (ITFC) of the incident." 13 14 And so can I be clear about this section: is it 15 a necessity that a firearms incident be declared before any of these -- this SOP is implemented? 16 No. The requirement is that it's -- if it is suspected, 17 Α. that it's brought to the attention of the ITFC before 18 officers are deployed, so it doesn't have to be declared 19 20 a firearms, it can still remain it's suspected but we 21 need more information and therefore we're going to still 22 deploy officers who aren't armed but with stringent control measures and tactical plan directions. 23 Right. So either declared a firearms incident, in which 24 Q. case it is absolutely part of this SOP? 25

1 Α. Yes. Or it could be suspected, you need more information but 2 Q. 3 you then couple that with stringent control measures? 4 Α. Yes. Thank you. And the sort of control measures, stringent 5 Q. control measures, are those the ones you mentioned 6 7 earlier when we were discussing --8 Yes, and it could even be deploying staff in an unmarked Α. 9 police vehicle first so that you're not attracting the 10 attention of people to it being a marked police vehicle, so your officers might still be in uniform but inside an 11 12 unmarked vehicle at a distance, in order to get closer 13 or even drive by and feed back the information then. 14 Q. We will come back to that. 15 Where it says "Initial Tactical Firearms Commander", if the scenario was that the ITFC was also the duty 16 17 inspector, would that be the duty inspector? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. Thank you. 20 Those two roles nationally go hand in hand. You usually Α. 21 find that the control room inspector is also an ITFC. 22 Q. We have heard that that involves extra training for the officer? 23 24 Α. Yes. Q. And then 9.5: 25

"The ITFC will ensure that it is clearly highlighted 1 that they are in command of the incident." 2 3 So can you explain what that would look like on the 4 ground? Yes, so in command and control, certainly from either 5 Α. the training I received and the training I delivered, 6 7 and also from incidents where inquiries have been held 8 and recommendations, there's always this -- there's 9 often this incident about who was in control of what 10 aspects and so certainly the training emphasises that it must always be clear who is in command of what function 11 12 and doing what. 13 So you will often hear officers actually then on the

Airwaves saying, "I am whoever, I am in command of this 14 15 incident" or "I am in command of the bronze scene", "I am the silver commander". So you will hear people 16 actually declare during incidents saying "I am" and 17 their name and saying what they're in command of. 18 What's the benefit of declaring that on the radio? 19 Q. So that all staff involved then know who they're 20 Α. 21 listening to and who they're feeding back to and who 22 they're asking for advice from because you've got the 23 three aspects, you've got the bronze at the scene and you've got the tactical plan decisions and resourcing 24 decisions, so you could have the two different 25

1 commanders, but as the operational staff you need to 2 know who is directing what aspect and who takes primacy. What do you mean by primacy? 3 Q. 4 Α. It is who outtrumps the other, so if the bronze level 5 made -- said they were going to do something, the silver commander can say "No, you're not, the direction is this 6 7 is what you're doing", and likewise, if gold aren't 8 happy with any of them, they come in to -- but you won't 9 get gold going straight to bronze, they come up and down 10 the chain, so gold would then feed to silver, "Tell bronze not to do this or do that", and so you will find 11 12 the philosophy of command and control is so that every 13 person involved in an incident clearly knows who has 14 what responsibilities and what roles. 15 Q. Can I ask you for some further guidance. First of all we will look at if a firearms incident is declared and 16 17 then I will look at a suspected firearms incident 18 afterwards. 19 Yes. Α. So let's take the scenario that a firearms incident is 20 Q. 21 declared. Can you explain who would be in each role 22 because we have heard about a controller, a sergeant and 23 an inspector at the ACR. 24 Α. Yes. We have heard about a PIO in the area who is an 25 Q.

1 inspector, and we have heard about a sergeant who is on 2 the ground.

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. I'm trying to understand if there was a declared 5 firearms incident, who would be in what role? Okay. So the initial tactical firearms commander is the 6 Α. 7 silver commander, so you would have the ACR inspector as 8 the firearms commander and they take primacy in relation 9 to the command decisions for the tactical plan and also 10 for resources, so if they then need resources from elsewhere you can't then have someone else saying "You 11 12 can't have them, I've got them doing something else". 13 It's like, no, they take primacy on behalf of the 14 constabulary, so they take the primacy there.

15 At the bronze level, where you have an inspector and a sergeant, because it's a hierarchy force with 16 17 the police, the inspector will always take primacy over the sergeant and especially when it's then a nominated 18 PIO role, they would become the bronze commander. The 19 20 sergeant's role would be delivering the tactics, 21 supervising the staff and doing the delivery with the 22 staff and safeguarding the mechanics and the actual issues for the staff safety and who they're dealing 23 with, their safety, but the command decision at bronze 24 25 would lay with the PIO.

1	Q.	Right, so if there's a firearms incident declared the
2		silver command is the ACR inspector?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	And we have heard some evidence that if a firearms
5		incident had been declared, the ACR inspector would have
6		seized command of that situation. The bronze command
7		would be the inspector, the PIO in the local area.
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	But the local sergeant would be supervising his response
10		team, delivering tactics and doing the mechanics?
11	A.	Yes, and they wouldn't be a commander.
12	Q.	No.
13	A.	You might then get several sergeants there at a bronze,
14		so, for example, I might turn up with a PSU team in
15		order to do a physical entry and search of the property,
16		so then as the sergeant I would go to the bronze
17		commander, like the inspector, and ask for the briefing
18		and look at what were we doing, then I would take my
19		team in to do shield entries and enforced entries and
20		search through the house.
21	Q.	So there could be potentially multiple sergeants doing
22		different roles?
23	A.	There could be multiple sergeants, yes.
24	Q.	But they would be looking to the local inspector who
25		would be the bronze commander?

1 Α. Yes. Right. And then let's look at the scenario where it is 2 Q. 3 simply a suspected firearms incident, so it's not been 4 declared one by the ACR inspector. 5 Α. Mm-hm. Can you help us understand how the governing structure 6 Q. would be in that situation? 7 8 So the principle is still the same, it's rank and role, Α. 9 so you have still got the control room inspector being 10 the initial spontaneous silver commander of any incident, until that role is formally agreed and handed 11 12 over to somebody else, and you have still got -- because 13 there's an inspector and a sergeant there, the inspector 14 would outtrump the sergeant in the rank stakes and the 15 inspector would be responsible for command decisions 16 there. 17 With the sergeant delivering the mechanics on the Q. ground? 18 19 Yes. Α. 20 And supervising staff? Q. 21 Α. Yes. Because one of the core issues around command and 22 control is the ability to manage, like, staff, but if as the sergeant you're actually dealing with the incident 23 24 you're not in a position to then manage, look at 25 spreadsheets and go: who can we get from where? You

1		haven't got the authority or the time to do that, so you
2		need people then who aren't actually delivering at the
3		front end, who are in a position that they can look at
4		screens, they can look they've got radio control,
5		they can talk to people and get the resources that are
6		needed.
7	Q.	How do officers on the ground understand that command
8		organisation?
9	A.	Well, I know the basics of command and control are
10		taught within probationer training in England and Wales.
11		I have not seen the training materials for
12		Police Scotland, but I know that it is covered the
13		basic principles and management of events and command
14		and control is included in probationer training within
15		England and Wales.
16	Q.	Right. And how would command decisions be shared with
17		officers on the ground?
18	A.	Through the bronze command, so the for example, the
19		bronze commander, so the inspector, unless they get
20		replaced by if there was a superintendent or
21		a chief inspector on duty there, they might then come
22		down and then announce "I am the bronze commander now",
23		because it works up the rank, not down the rank, so then
24		they would give input to the sergeant who then delivers
25		the message to the constables, and it's about trying

1		to you don't want lots of different people going for
2		the answers. It's got to be narrow so that you get
3		a message cascading down, up and down the command
4		structure.
5	Q.	And is that those commands, would they be via
6		the police radio, the Airwaves transmissions?
7	Α.	It may be via the radio, or if they're physically there,
8		they will pass it. You know, I know from my own
9		experience sometimes the location inspector, so the
10		bronze commander, is on the phone to the control room
11		receiving information, they then come to me, brief me,
12		then I go to the PCs and say: right, this is what we're
13		doing.
14	Q.	And when you say "me", you're envisaging yourself in
15		a sergeant role on the ground
16	A.	As a sergeant for that one, yes.
17	Q.	with your team present with you?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	And if, for example, the inspector, divisional
20		inspector, the PIO, is in a police office, he is on the
21		phone, he can see his screen, but he is not actually
22		communicating on the Airwaves at that moment in time,
23		how is it that any command decisions would be shared
24		with the sergeant and the officers?
25	Α.	So they would either then use the radio to notify the

1		sergeant, or mobile phone to the sergeant, or there's
2		the back-to-back channel on the Airwaves terminal as
3		well.
4	Q.	Is that the same as point-to-point?
5	A.	Yes, yes.
6	Q.	So we have heard that there can be direct calls
7		point-to-point or there can be Airwaves transmissions
8		that effectively anyone can listen to on the channel?
9	A.	Yes, yes. But certainly in training we would encourage
10		people not to use the back-to-back and point-to-point
11		because of for records of events afterwards, for the
12		debriefing, for if anything has gone wrong, for critical
13		incident reviewing, managing, any civil or criminal
14		cases that come from it, so if they go
15		back-to-back/point-to-point, you're not then getting the
16		audio recorded and translated so
17	Q.	I mean, you have probably seen a spreadsheet, a combined
18		audio and visual timeline which lists
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	Airwaves transmissions in chronological order.
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	If it's point-to-point, those calls would not be part of
23		that?
24	A.	They would not appear.
25	Q.	Right, thank you. If we can look at 9.6:

1 "Each and every incident will require to be progressed on its own merits and as such, much will 2 3 depend upon the quality and quantity of the information 4 that is available. Any deployment of police resources 5 to alleged high threat situations should follow safe response procedures unless there are sound and objective 6 7 reasons to discount the allegations. The facts that a 8 reporter appeared to be under the influence of drugs or 9 alcohol or chose to remain anonymous are not objective 10 reasons to disregard established safe procedures." Can you explain a little about that? 11 12 Α. So safe procedures, you can't always get the safest 13 procedure, so you have to try and make it as safe as you 14 can in the circumstance, so your initial decision might 15 be the contain and keeping distance, reporting back, but then you see -- you know, you're near to a school, it's 16 17 3.15, or whatever, it's kicking out time and now you see 18 a group of primary school children walking towards the person, so you know now you've got this threat and if 19 20 you can't get to the children to divert them, you might 21 then have to do something else and stop that distance, 22 but all the time you're reviewing it and thinking what is the actual risk because we've got potential risks, 23 24 hypothetical risks but we have also got to weigh that up 25 with what is the actual risk that we're dealing with now

1 and second-to-second, minute-to-minute that can change, 2 it can go up and down, you know, how are your staff 3 dealing, but it's about if you are diverting from safer 4 options which you have been instructed to do you need to 5 be able to justify it because ultimately somebody's life is on the line and that might either be an officer, the 6 7 subject or a member of the public so you need to be able to justify why you have diverted from core tactics. 8 You're talking about factoring in new information all 9 Q. 10 the time. We have heard some evidence about the NDM, 11 the National Decision-Making Model --12 Α. Yes. -- and how new information is coming in that's 13 Q. immediately factored into this cycle of review? 14 15 Α. Yes. Is that the sort of process that you're describing? 16 Q. Definitely and this is always going round, so every 17 Α. little bit of new information, it's coming and then you 18 19 might get some information but then it's discounted and 20 so you've got to constantly be feeding that in and 21 thinking "What now? What are we going to do now? Do we 22 back off? Do we move forward?" you know, left, right. 23 And just because you start with an avenue of actions doesn't mean to say you have to see it through to the 24 end. You can come back, refresh again and then move 25

1		forward again, or stay static.
2	Q.	And that's always an option for the discretion of
3		the individual officers?
4	A.	Yes, it's always fluid and it should always be in
5		response to actual threat/risk information rather than
6		rigid and hypothetical.
7	Q.	You're talking about the speed of change and the speed
8		at which change can happen. Do you understand that
9		have you got an understanding of how quickly things can
10		change?
11	A.	Oh, absolutely. Everything changes. I mean, the main
12		firearms incident that we had in Cumbria was the
13		Derrick Bird mass shootings and when that happened that
14		morning again, there's me and my chief inspector in our
15		office outside the control room and we instantly got
16		contacted by the chief inspector and the control room
17		inspector just saying they've had a call come in about
18		a shotgun or a weapon has been heard, but I think the
19		initial thing was there's a shotgun sound being heard
20		near the taxi rank in the town.
21		Now, with being a rural force you're used to

21 Now, with being a rural force you're used to 22 firearms incidents, as in "We have heard a shotgun, it's 23 like lamping or scaring of birds", but this was unusual 24 because you don't normally in the middle of the morning 25 get a report of a shotgun sound in the town centre at

1 a taxi rank, so straight off the advice that the control room looked for from us was "Do we declare this or not?" 2 and we could only -- in our roles we could only provide 3 4 advice, we can't make the decision, the decision 5 ultimately rests with the ACR inspector, but the advice we gave that day was to immediately declare it 6 7 a suspected firearms incident whilst we set up and 8 looked for more information because it's easier to stand 9 everything down than not, so before the -- the ARVs were 10 then being looked for to also inform to start travelling to the areas, but then in the same time, second, third 11 12 calls started coming in and so I was then in the control room as well hearing these things coming in and the 13 dilemma was: is this multiple people reporting the same 14 15 call, or are these multiple people reporting multiple incidents, and at that point we still didn't know but we 16 were working on the basis that this was a firearms 17 incident now after that second call was coming in, we're 18 19 deeming this a firearms incident.

20 My boss went straight upstairs to the chief 21 constable's suite to get one of those officers. 22 I directed my team to switch on the gold command suite 23 which is next door to the control room because it's 24 easier to knock it down if it's proved not to be. 25 Unarmed uniformed officers in the local area were being

1		informed of the reports, but the clear message was given
2		to them to not to not approach any suspect, to only
3		feed back information and that we would give a further
4		update in relation to ARVs and dogs. So that was all
5		going on then to and treating it basically it was
6		easier to ramp it up than come too late to it, so all
7		the safeguards were being put in straight away until it
8		was confirmed what it was.
9	Q.	So depending on the particular circumstances and
10		I appreciate that can change very quickly for we
11		have heard that in Scotland if you wish to deploy an
12		ARV, you have to have the authority of the inspector
13		the duty inspector at the ACR?
14	A.	Yes, and that was the same as we had as well.
15	Q.	Right. And we have also heard from Mr Graves that in
16		London they don't need that authority because the ARVs
17		are deployed they're roaming round London all the
18		time, ready to be sent to an incident
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	so they don't need that authority. But in Cumbria
21		you also needed the authority?
22	A.	Yes, the authority.
23	Q.	And for a situation where multiple calls come in, as we
24		have described, and it's a grade 1 call, knife incident,
25		I would like to focus on what would be a reasonable

1 officer response to that, bearing in mind the situation with the inspector in Scotland. 2 3 We have heard two possible options and I would like 4 your views on them: 1, that an ARV is deployed 5 immediately and then stood down if it is not needed within a short time; alternatively that contact is made 6 7 with an ARV team, they are not deployed but the 8 inspector waits for feedback and further information. 9 Do you think both of those are within the range of 10 reasonable options? They're both within the range of reasonable options and 11 Α. 12 just from our basis that we were running at the time was 13 we erred on the side of caution and to deploy to 14 a suspected because then you could cancel them because 15 it might be several minutes and each minute counts if somebody's life is at risk, so -- but either option 16 could be a reasonable option. 17 Thank you. Are you able to indicate from your own 18 Q. experience or otherwise how common it is for ARVs to be 19

20 deployed to a knife incident?

A. It's not. If you think about the proportion of
incidents and the proportion of times you actually ask
for them, it's not common in that respect. Likewise
asking for dogs, you know -- you know, certainly as
operational officers, or anywhere within the command

1 structure, you know in an ideal world you would have a dog attached to every shift and an ARV, but you know 2 3 that they're in short supply and so you have to be 4 careful when you ask for them because you don't want to 5 take it to your incident and then leave officers at a more serious incident where it should have gone, so 6 7 basically it's not common to keep having ARVs and dogs 8 attend your incidents. Q. So it wouldn't be reasonable for anyone to be always 9 10 deploying ARVs or dogs to every incident? 11 Α. No, no. 12 And what circumstances would you consider where it would Q. 13 be reasonable to deploy an ARV and a dog unit? Where you're thinking about either it's either 14 Α. 15 a confirmed incident, so either confirmed physical firearm, confirmed physical weapon of high risk, or 16 17 because of the volume of information coming in, it's 18 likely to be confirmed, either of those, because you 19 might have, for example, someone with an imitation 20 firearm, like an antique firearm or something and 21 a member of the public with good intentions says they 22 have seen someone with a gun, because they have seen someone with a gun, but it's an imitation or a model in 23 some ways, it's not an illegal possession but they did 24 see someone with a gun, or it's where you're balancing 25

1 up that risk and thinking officers without taser still 2 trying to deal with someone with a knife are at 3 high risk of being stabbed or shot, and so you don't 4 want to be deploying officers to those situations if you 5 think that you have a safer option available to safeguard them and so all the time you're thinking about 6 7 is it available? If it's not available because it's on 8 a higher risk incident then again, you're back to: we're 9 left with what we're left with, how can we make this 10 safer, so all the time you're thinking about: if we're left with what we're left with, how can we do it safer 11 12 to try and avoid no one being injured or killed. 13 But where an ARV is available, multiple calls on Q. 14 a Sunday morning, calls from separate members of the 15 public, would a reasonable officer deploy an ARV straight away or would they wait for feedback? 16 I think if they're content that it's a firearms or 17 Α. 18 a suspected firearms based on the volume of information, 19 I think the reasonable officer would authorise, but 20 having never been that role my -- as an advisor I would 21 be advising that they erred on the side of caution because it's easier to stand them down. 22 But ultimately it would be a matter for their --23 Q. It's for that ITFC to make that decision. 24 Α. And in relation to deploying a dog unit, again, in 25 Q.

1 a situation where there's multiple calls on a Sunday 2 morning, a knife incident, calls being made by separate 3 members of the public, what would a reasonable officer 4 do in relation to a dog unit? 5 So dogs can be deployed by controllers or supervisors, Α. 6 so there I would be expecting the dog to be deployed 7 because there's more than enough to -- with suspicion --8 if the dog is available, then you want the dog heading 9 that way and certainly if I was then on the ground as 10 the patrol sergeant I would be thinking: I don't want to send myself and my staff in to a high risk incident when 11 12 I know there's a dog several minutes away who can go in 13 first. To what extent do you think a reasonable officer would 14 Q. 15 wait or instruct the other officers wait for the arrival 16 of the dog if they're attending an incident in those circumstances? 17 18 I think there would be -- I think the reasonable officer Α. 19 would tell the staff to hang back because the safer 20 option is the dog, so if the safer option is available 21 and at the minute if we can do as -- the tactic of 22 observing and seeing from a distance and seeing at the 23 moment that no one else is in danger --No member of the public? 24 Q. Yes, so if you can see that no member of the public is 25 Α.

1		in imminent danger, you can keep your staff held back
2		awaiting the dog, but then if a member of the public
3		became in immediate danger then you've got to review
4		that decision.
5	Q.	So again, dependent on the circumstances you see at the
6		scene.
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	Can I ask about moving on from this situation, moving on
9		to a scenario where the sergeant on the ground who is in
10		charge of the response team makes a request for all
11		units or an ARV and a dog unit and, not just or
12		again, in your experience, how common is it for
13		a sergeant on the ground to make that request over the
14		Airwaves?
15	Α.	It's not common to ask for all of that because you know
16		that if you're constantly asking for it, it's like
17		the boy who cried wolf scenario. You have to be careful
18		and mindful how often you're asking for it and when
19		you're asking for it and justifying it, because again,
20		if you start getting these units deployed to you, you
21		might be putting staff at serious risk in another
22		policing area because you have taken that resource.
23	Q.	But making that request, that request coming from the
24		sergeant, is that within the range of options open to
25		a sergeant?

1 Α. Yes, so they can request it, yes. 2 And in response to that request, what actions would you Q. 3 expect others to take in response to that? 4 Α. I would expect in that line if the sergeant has asked 5 for this information that that then should be immediately considered by the control room because at 6 7 the end of the day they're the only ones who can actually contact those resources and deploy them. 8 Q. So if we have heard that in response to that there was 9 10 contact made with the dog unit to see whether they were available, that would be within the sort of reasonable 11 12 range of things that you would expect to happen? Yes, and plus then the control room takes primacy in 13 Α. 14 relation to deployment, so the dog handler might say 15 "Well, I'm actually engaged on an incident here", but the control room inspector, for example, can then 16 17 compare that incident with what they're asking for here and then take primacy and say, "No, you're being 18 deployed to this incident". 19 So again, in this scenario that we're discussing, you 20 Q. 21 would expect a reasonable inspector to be part of that

22 consideration --

A. Yes, yes.

24 Q. -- and that review?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. If that inspector wasn't available, who would you expect in the control room to be involved in that? 2 Well, the control room inspectors -- the role is 3 Α. 4 designed to be immediately available 24/7, so if they're 5 not immediately available you need to get them, so where are they? Because their deputy can't necessarily --6 7 they can't authorise to the same extent that the control 8 room inspector is, so that's where you need as a team 9 and a function to always have those available, or 10 readily available and if the inspector isn't there -because they can't stay in the room all the time, so 11 12 it's how quick can you get them, because they need 13 involved in making that decision. Q. In light of a scenario where the sergeant on the ground 14 15 has made this request, to what extent would you expect a reasonable member of staff in the control room to give 16 weight to the sergeant's request? 17 I think it should be given a good level of weight. 18 Α. Why do you say that? 19 Q. On the grounds that it's not common practice for 20 Α. 21 sergeants to constantly ask for these, and chances are, 22 they know information that the control room staff don't know. They know the information about the staff 23 involved, they know the information potentially about 24 the location and especially now as all forces have gone 25

1 to the area control room set-up rather than station 2 control rooms, you are relying on that local knowledge 3 and that local command sergeant or inspector, to 4 understand a bit more about the team and the location 5 and the risks. So you would expect them to be -- to have more local 6 Q. 7 knowledge of the area but also to know more about their 8 team and their response team? Yes, so you don't ask for specialist resources lightly, 9 Α. 10 so if a sergeant on the ground is saying "We need this", then my advice would be you would be looking for 11 12 justification why not to give them it, and if the 13 resource was available, you need to get them the resource. 14 15 Q. We have heard evidence from Martin Graves, you have watched his evidence. 16 A. Yes. 17 18 Q. And he was of the view that an inspector at the ACR --19 it would be within a reasonable inspector in that 20 position -- it would be within their options to either 21 deploy the ARV, or to contact them, not deploy them, but 22 wait for feedback. Do you agree with Martin Graves? 23 A. Yes, I agree. Q. Can you help us understand what difference it might make 24 25 to officers on the ground if a sergeant makes that

1 request and if the control room then deploy an ARV, arrange for a dog unit to attend, and the sergeant has 2 3 requested all units, can you explain what effect that 4 might have on individual officers? 5 It's a significant impact in relation to confidence and Α. worry, because if you're going to an incident that you 6 7 think is high risk but you're aware that specialist 8 resources and other resources are coming, then you know 9 you've got more staff for dealing safer with an 10 incident, but if you know that you are it and you have still got this high risk incident, then you know that's 11 12 going to impact on what tactical options you've got and 13 what variations that you've got as well. And also for 14 your own personal safety, you know then if there's -- if 15 you're it, you know that there's potentially a higher risk to your safety, rather than if you know there's 16 17 colleagues either arriving with you, or imminently 18 behind.

Q. Can I move on to the stay safe message. I would like to -- so taking this scenario that we're working through at the moment where a stay safe message is sent, where the inspector in the control room goes on to the Airwaves saying:

24 "I'm monitoring this obviously from an ARV25 perspective. If you get sightings of the male you need

to make an initial assessment yourself and feed back through straight away and I will listen out on the channel."

Now, you have told us already about how you would
see a stay safe message being communicated, so if we
assume that a stay safe message along these lines has
been communicated, to what extent do you think that that
communicates all that would be required in a stay safe
message?

10 Α. I think that it needs to be short, sharp, precise, no ambiguity in the message, and capable for the officers 11 12 to hear, so short and snappy, keywords, and clear about 13 the mandate, so sometimes if you give officers that 14 freedom of saying like "Make your own decision, decide 15 this", does that mean they're to keep distance, or they 16 can interact with the person, so it's about clarity, like "Do not approach, feed back first". 17

18 Q. And earlier today, am I right in thinking you said the 19 controller in the ACR can also give a stay safe message?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. That could be at an early stage?

22 A. Yes.

Q. And in response to that type of message that I have just
described, what would you expect a reasonable officer to
give back to ACR in terms of feed back?

1	A.	Definitely that they are approaching the scene, or
2		arriving at scene, ideally approaching the scene and
3		what they can first initially see, so is that one
4		person, you know, one suspect, several suspects, any
5		sight of weapons, any other factors of risk, so members
6		of the public nearby or not, so some key principles
7		like: suspect sighted, one person, no knife visible, or
8		knife visible, no members of the public in immediate
9		vicinity, by the road, you know, whatever, but just some
10		key principal factors of what is making this a risk or
11		not, higher risk or lower risk.
12	Q.	And is that something that officers are generally
13		trained to do?
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	And can that be provided at any point where they have
16		access to their radio?
17	A.	Yes, either through push and speak, or if need be, the
18		red button which turns your mic live.
19	Q.	We have heard evidence that there's something called an
20		emergency button?
21	A.	Yes.
22	MS	GRAHAME: I'm going to be moving on. I'm conscious we're
23		a minute to 1.00. Would you like
24	LOR	D BRACADALE: Well, that might be a good point to stop
25		for lunch. We will sit at 2 o'clock.

1	MS	GRAHAME: Thank you.
2	(12	.59 pm)
3		(The luncheon adjournment)
4	(2.	00 pm)
5	LOR	D BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
6	MS	GRAHAME: Thank you.
7		Ms Caffrey, I would like to move on to look at the
8		tactical options that may be available to reasonable
9		officers
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	who are about to attend a grade 1 knife incident, in
12		the scenario that I have described to you earlier.
13	A.	Okay.
14	Q.	So we will continue on with that scenario. I'm going to
15		suggest four of them to you and I will be asking you if
16		those options would be open to reasonable officers and
17		if you can explain what they would look like.
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	So the first scenario that I'm going to suggest to you
20		is non-engagement by the officers and they would move to
21		a rendezvous point at a more remote area, for example,
22		in the Hayfield Road location, Gallaghers car park
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	Gallaghers pub car park, and officers could park in
25		the car park, wait there in the same position, the same

1 location, keep their eyes on the subject, if he walked off they could try and they could try to contain him, 2 3 they would have to be fluid, there would be a potential 4 risk to members of the public if they appeared, it would 5 have to be closely monitored, but they would take a point of view from Gallaghers car park, see the 6 7 roundabout, the streets in that area, and while they 8 were waiting, be feeding back to the ACR. So that's the -- we will call that the rendezvous point option. 9 10 Α. Yes. Is it your view that it would be open to reasonable 11 Q. 12 officers attending a knife incident to embark on that 13 option of -- way of proceeding? Yes, that would be one tactical option. 14 Α. 15 Right. And would that tactical option remain open to Q. officers if it had been declared a firearms incident by 16 an ACR inspector? 17 Yes, but if it had been declared a firearms incident 18 Α. 19 then there would be a mandate from the ACR informing 20 officers not to approach. 21 Q. Right. And would it remain an option if a firearms 22 incident was not declared by the ACR inspector? 23 Yes. Α. Would it be an option open to the sergeant on the 24 Q. 25 ground, the divisional sergeant?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	Would it be an option open to the PIO, the inspector in
3		the divisional area?
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	Would it be an option for individual officers attending
6		the scene?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	So it's within all of their respective discretions
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	to choose that option?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	And would you be able to help the Chair understand what
13		reasonable officers would do when at a rendezvous point,
14		if they have opted for that tactical option?
15	Α.	So the main benefit of the rendezvous point is for
16		additional staff to meet and then to discuss rapidly the
17		tactical options of how they can work the incident with
18		the numbers of staff that they've got, so whether that
19		be two officers, four, six, 12, but it gives them time
20		to come together and hopefully then produce
21		a coordinated option and that might be then deploying so
22		many to one part of the scene and so many being in
23		reserve, but it would then be an agreed plan and ideally
24		led by a supervising officer.
25	Q.	Is this type of RVP scenario akin to the spontaneous

1		RVP rendezvous point that you mentioned this morning
2		in your example?
3	Α.	Yes, absolutely, yes.
4	Q.	So not the formal
5	Α.	No.
6	Q.	planned RVP?
7	A.	No.
8	Q.	And you have said that officers would come together,
9		there could be a coordinated option. What do you mean
10		by that?
11	Α.	So that's where, for example, if the sergeant was there,
12		or a constable would take the lead to say "This is what
13		I think we should do", you know, and deciding what skill
14		sets were there, who is better able to do certain
15		tactics, and this is where it's vital that you
16		understand who is in the team and you know what their
17		experiences are, what their capabilities are, so you
18		would look at their experience, the qualities of their
19		training, matching them with the potential demographics
20		of the person because that person could be an 80-year
21		old lady who has escaped sorry, "escaped" is the
22		wrong word who has left a care home, who has got
23		dementia, but she too could have a knife, so then you
24		might think then well looking at the demographics of
25		your staff, who is potentially better able and willing

1 to take the lead for the contact role, so the conversation, but then if you're looking for tactical 2 3 application of use of force then you may then look at 4 the experience of who you've got and what competencies 5 exist in using the force, who is then going to take over as the supervisor of any use of force, you know, so it's 6 7 about trying to fit the demographics of the people that 8 you've got with the demographics of the suspect or subject that you're going to deal with. 9 10 Q. And allowing that time at the rendezvous point from what

11 you're saying suggests that it provides more opportunity 12 for officers to consider the skills and experience of 13 the members of the team.

Yes, and even down to, you know, if it does end up going 14 Α. 15 to a restraint, allocating who is taking what role in 16 the restraint, so you might then be looking at "You're 17 the leg person, you're one of the arm persons", and so 18 that's -- the officers then know what the plan is, what the loose plan is, so you don't end up with everybody 19 20 laying over their legs and nobody has got hold of the 21 arms, so especially when there's a higher risk and 22 a potential for a weapon that might be concealed, you're thinking then about if it gets to that point, the 23 containment, the restraint, the searching, you know, who 24 is going to do the search. 25

Q. So to what extent is there a -- if a plan is created, to
 what extent does that allow additional benefits to the
 officers in terms of protecting their safety and the
 safety of others?

5 Yes, both because the more efficient you can make the Α. process, the quicker it is. It's then reducing the risk 6 7 of chaos because sometimes you find with interventions 8 it ends up in chaos because nobody knows who is doing 9 what, so the more you can warn and plan, the more then 10 it's hopefully -- it's hopefully time-efficient, safety-efficient and therefore reduces the risk to all 11 12 parties because you've got this tactic in place of who 13 is trying to do what role, who is taking control, who is 14 going to be the supervisor, who is going to be the 15 safety officer. If members of the public appear, who is 16 going to deal with them because again, you wouldn't want 17 everybody letting go at one point thinking nobody else 18 is doing that, so you could allocate rapid roles and all 19 of this -- we're only talking matters of seconds for 20 a supervisor to rapidly allocate roles and if it's 21 a tactic which is used regular within that shift, people 22 then will automatically say, "I will do whatever, I will 23 do this", and within small teams you start becoming aware of who does which role within that team. 24 I was going to ask you, how long does this --25 Q.

1	Α.	Very quick, very quick.
2	Q.	creating a tactical plan
3	Α.	Very quick.
4	Q.	Very quick.
5	A.	Yes.
6	Q.	You said a moment ago seconds?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	So not a lengthy period?
9	Α.	No, it's not a write-down plan and that, it's very
10		rapid. People know what the roles are so it might be
11		head officer, you know, left arm, right arm, legs,
12		you're the supervisor, you know, you're the member of
13		the public", so people know rapidly what is their
14		primary role if it's required.
15	Q.	What about permitting time for specialist resources to
16		arrive? Would a rendezvous point option permit that?
17	Α.	Absolutely, because the rendezvous point then will allow
18		the time for specialist officers to arrive, but also
19		afford the staff there the visibility of the scenario,
20		so that if it becomes no longer viable to wait, they can
21		rapidly intervene, but they can also then be assured
22		for example, if a member of the public is about to walk
23		in on it, they're going to have to then do something,
24		but if they're kind of able to confirm the public is not
25		at imminent risk, we have still got time to wait for the

1 resources.

2	Q.	So when you say no longer viable to wait, what type of
3		situation would you expect to mean reasonable officers
4		would say it's no longer viable to wait?
5	Α.	So this would be where if the person is continuing to
6		move but they're now trying to get into somebody's
7		property, or they're trying to they're going into
8		a hospital but again, you're going to need to feed that
9		back to the tactical for advice about what to do because
10		the whole scenario is increasing in risk.
11		You might see the group of children walking towards.
12		With some members of the public you can verbally shout
13		to them to back off. You could then look at, well, can
14		you get a police vehicle in-between the member of the
15		public who is walking in that direction and cut them off
16		before they actually get near the person. There's
17		ultimately many scenarios that you could consider, but
18		this is where the benefit is often having a supervisor
19		involved in that part so they can be thinking about the
20		wider health and safety factors for all people
21		concerned.
22	Q.	And that supervisor could be the sergeant on the ground?
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	And when I read out the scenario there was a suggestion
25		of it having to be fluid. Does that permit

1 an opportunity for reasonable officers to continue to observe but if new information arises, new 2 3 circumstances, things change, that can be fed into the 4 National Decision-Making Model? 5 Yes, yes, and respond when needed. Α. Right. And then can you tell us what you would expect 6 Q. 7 in terms of feedback to ACR or to other officers, if 8 officers were gathered in a rendezvous point? 9 Again, so those key factors of officers -- the person Α. 10 who you're watching, so the subject, members of the public, so you want to keep those three things fluid, 11 12 updates on all of these: is there any risk involved. 13 Object -- constantly updating whether there is an object 14 visible or not because even though there is no object 15 visible doesn't mean to say there isn't an object. When you say "object" you mean? 16 Q. An object as in an object of concern, so it could be 17 Α. 18 a weapon, it could be stolen property, so it's whether -- it's what relevance that object has. And 19 20 then place, so is the person moving, have they gone now 21 onto a road, because if they're in the highway it 22 increases the risk to that person themselves on the 23 road, because they could get run over, and then thinking 24 about what can we actually see of the person, is there 25 anything yet telling us more, is this a criminal

intervention or is it a medical intervention that
 the police are there for.

Q. What sort of information could a reasonable officer be hoping to gather in about the subject themselves in terms of assessing things such as mental health or otherwise?

7 Α. Okay, so one of the things that's often used within 8 police is looking at vulnerability assessment framework 9 and it's an A, B, C category of looking at A, the appearance of the person, so how are they appearing, so 10 whatever you can see about the appearance, is it 11 12 different in any way to this like normal person who 13 would be in that same situation, so that could be either 14 visually looking, mode of dress, so how are they 15 appearing, do they appear drunk, intoxicated, are they incapable of walking in a straight line, what is that 16 17 appearance and then that links us into B, which is the specific behaviour, so what are they actually doing 18 19 because then is the behaviour then indicating concerns 20 for perhaps the intoxication, the mental health, some 21 other kind of medical emergency, are they grabbing their chest as they're stumbling around because it might then 22 indicate concerns about heart attack, angina attacks, so 23 then when you get on with C and communication, the 24 25 communication one, it's difficult from a distance but

1 not impossible because are they shouting out at 2 [passers-by], is it appropriate what they're shouting 3 now, so try and -- is the communication verbal, 4 non-verbal, how is that communication? And within all 5 of this look at dress, is it appropriate for the situation. The D then is the dangers that's involved, 6 7 so are they about to walk into the road, onto a train 8 track, go into water -- you know, a harbour, so what are 9 the specific dangers that's about. Then environment, 10 are there any specific issues about the environment, so 11 close to a mental health unit, close to a hospital, 12 close to a school, highly populated residential areas, 13 or is it commercial areas, so all of these factors are 14 often looked at in relation to this is the kind of 15 feedback which is relevant to the risk. So in terms of a reasonable officer, is that the type of 16 Q. 17 exercise they're carrying out while they're gathered in 18 a rendezvous point? 19 Yes. Α. And you have said that a reasonable officer would then 20 Q. 21 be feeding back that type of information to ACR? 22 Α. Yes. 23 And other officers who are listening? Q. A. Yes, because that's ultimately assisting the inspector 24 there and the ACR team to work out about changes of 25

1 risk, any update they maybe then need to pass on to 2 specialist resources who are attending, so the 3 specialist resources might not yet be on that radio 4 channel to hear this, so they act as the mid-person to 5 communicate the updates to the specialist resources. 6 Thank you. And you were talking about A, appearance. Q. 7 Α. Yes. And that included dress, so, for example, if a person 8 Q. 9 was out on a wet day, it was cooler, and they were 10 wearing a T-shirt with short sleeves, is that the type of information that an officer would be looking for? 11 12 Yes, because you could consider it inappropriate for the Α. 13 circumstances, or rather, not normal for the 14 circumstances. Likewise, if it was a really hot day and 15 the person is in a great big heavy winter coat then you would go "That's not normal for the circumstances", so 16 17 it's not saying you can't do these things but they're 18 just extra triggers for people to think, "Well, why is 19 the dress different to, you know, what you would expect 20 in that environment?"

Q. And you mentioned that they're also looking out for
signs of intoxication, maybe through drink and drugs?
A. Definitely. Intoxication and mental health. The police
are well-known for dealing with a large volume of people
who are suffering from the effects of intoxication or

1 mental health crisis and so the more that they can recognise the warning signs for this -- because at the 2 3 end of the day the police officers are not healthcare 4 practitioners, so they're taught to look for signs, and 5 it's those signs then that need to be passed to go "There's a lot of signs now, it's still not proof but 6 7 there's signs that's indicating this might be something 8 else".

9 Q. When a reasonable officer sees signs, what would they
10 do, what would they be --

So they need to be passed back because one of the early 11 Α. 12 considerations for the ACR as well is about medical 13 support from the ambulance service, so if they're then 14 thinking "Well, we're now hearing from the officers at 15 the scene watching all these signs that a tick box -you know, they're ticking our list here as well", if 16 17 they haven't already contacted the ambulance crew, they might then now start thinking, "I think we need to 18 19 contact the local ambulance service and start saying to 20 them about attending to be on standby because it's 21 looking more likely that it might be an incident for them to deal with rather than" --22 We have heard that if officers identify a medical 23 Q.

24 emergency that they can contact through their radios ACR 25 and the ACR will go away and arrange for the ambulance

1		to attend, is that correct?
2	A.	Yes, yes. There's working practices between all of the
3		category one responders, so the police, the
4		ambulance service, the fire service, but the
5		communications is via the police control room, so the
6		officer on the ground can't contact them direct, it all
7		goes through from the police control room to the likes
8		of the ambulance service and then they contact the
9		ambulance crew who then come.
10	Q.	So the officer on the ground can observe, look out for
11		signs and then feed back those signs to the ACR and they
12		can then decide if an ambulance is to be contacted?
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	You have also talked about danger and environment.
15	A.	Mm-hm.
16	Q.	Could you help us a little more about the sort of
17		dangers or environmental issues that a reasonable
18		officer would be observing and feeding back.
19	A.	Yes, so both of them are quite specific to the location
20		and circumstances at the time and the danger could be
21		because of the person is by a main road and that road
22		there's a difference whether it's a country lane or
23		a motorway and whether they're about to go over a bridge
24		in case then they fall over the bridge, or whether
25		they're going towards a harbour end, so the danger links

1		into the environmental issues as well, but also the
2		weather issues. It's whatever is specific to that
3		scenario that day.
4	Q.	And then I forgot to ask you about C.
5	A.	Communication.
6	Q.	You talked about non-verbal communication. I would be
7		interested in knowing what you mean by that?
8	A.	Yes, so, for example, the person could be talking to
9		thin air, or the person could be standing hitting
10		themselves and appearing to be mumbling, so all of that
11		is still part of the communication. They're
12		demonstrating through their communication to themselves
13		that it's potentially a mental health crisis going on,
14		so just talking into mid-air, talking at objects rather
15		than people, or if they're shouting at people
16		indiscriminately, all of that communication still needs
17		feeding back as well because it's all vital to indicate
18		is it crime, or is it medical.
19	Q.	Thank you. Can I ask you if officers do take the
20		decision, or a sergeant takes the decision to gather at
21		a rendezvous point and they are gathered there, what
22		impact does that have on the ACR, the staff there? What
23		importance do they place on that?
24	Α.	Well, chances are if they think they have deployed
25		someone straight to the scene and now the staff on the

1 ground are going "We're not going straight to the scene", they should then be thinking is this 2 3 disobedience of a lawful order or is there something 4 else, so that should then be triggering them to think 5 what do the officers know or believe that we don't see, and sometimes, you know, that's all it comes down to, 6 7 that the officers on the ground with the local knowledge know something or believe something that the area 8 control room can't because they don't have that local 9 10 knowledge. And in terms of a situation if the officers decide and 11 Q. 12 then the sergeant becomes aware of that, what impact 13 would that have on a reasonable sergeant? Again, it should be indicating to them "What's the 14 Α. 15 problem?" you know, "Do I need to -- as the sergeant, do I need to take them into this and manage them into this? 16 17 Do I need to brief them? What is it that's holding them 18 back? What are they seeing or thinking that I, as the 19 sergeant or the control room, aren't seeing?" So again, 20 it's just that extra warning light to say "Something's 21 not right here", because business as normal officers get 22 told to go to an incident and they go, so for someone 23 then to go "Mm-hm, no" ...

Q. And would that be the same warning light if the sergeanthad made the decision or the PIO had made the decision

1		to gather at a rendezvous point?
2	A.	Yes, definitely.
3	Q.	When we talk about the benefits of gathering at
4		a rendezvous point would this also permit an opportunity
5		to wait for, say, a dog unit?
6	A.	Definitely, yes.
7	Q.	Or an ARV if that was deemed appropriate?
8	A.	Yes, yes.
9	Q.	Right, thank you. I would like to move on to the second
10		scenario, if I may. Again, this is a non-engagement
11		scenario, if I may call it observe, wait and feed back,
12		but perhaps at a nearby location.
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	So observe, wait and feed back. And this would be
15		a scenario or a tactical option where the officers
16		wouldn't move to a remote rendezvous point, but perhaps
17		park nearby in the street at the end of the street, or
18		in the vicinity, even perhaps driving by the area. They
19		would observe, wait and feed back. They could park and
20		remain within the vehicle but observe, wait and feed
21		back to the ACR, perhaps stop a short distance away and
22		say to themselves "I can see him, this is what's
23		happening to him", so observing what the subject looks
24		like, what he is doing, what's happening at that moment
25		in time and the location, and then creating some space

1 and some distance there, so not bringing themselves out of the vehicle into potential harm's way. 2 3 Again, as a tactical option open to reasonable 4 officers would you -- in the scenario we have been 5 discussing about the knife incident, would you agree 6 that was an option open to reasonable officers? 7 Α. Yes, definitely. 8 And if we imagine these reasonable officers carrying out Q. 9 this option, how would they -- or what would they be 10 communicating with the ACR while they're doing this observation? 11 12 Α. Similar things again as what would be passed back from 13 the rendezvous point, just now that you're closer to the 14 person, so same things again about the appearance, what 15 you can see, the behaviour, the communications, any 16 dangers, the environmental factors, so as much as 17 possible and then ensuring that you've got an escape route as well because if it does escalate you need to 18 either be able to, you know, quick U-turn or move 19 20 forward if you need to do that, so it's constantly being 21 flexible and responsive to either act -- act either to 22 go forward or to reverse. Q. So if circumstances change and perhaps a vulnerable 23 member of the public comes onto the scene, the 24 officers -- reasonable officers can respond to that 25

1 immediately?

2 A. Yes, yes.

- 3 Q. So they're not required to wait there for a particular 4 length of time?
- A. No, because ultimately the priority -- the policing priority is always the preservation of life, so if life is at risk then the reasonable officer is always going to try and respond to that, but officers are never expected or mandated to put their own lives at risk in order to save the life of another. A lot of officers will, but they're not mandated to do that.
- 12 Q. What benefits are there to waiting and creating a little13 bit of time and space?
- 14 Again, it's gathering more information and intelligence Α. 15 in which to then feed back into the NDM so that you're hopefully then looking at a more accurate risk and 16 17 threat picture and also then that you can think about the policies and procedures as well because what are we 18 19 in, because you can have the same person but if you're 20 looking at them under an arrest model, or a help model 21 then your response is going to be different, so the more 22 information that you can gather, hopefully then the more 23 accurate your response is with the plan.
- Q. Tell us about this help model or arrest model analysis?
 A. So that's basically there what -- if you've got enough

1 information to think this is actually a person in 2 a medical health, or a mental health crisis and again 3 they need a medical intervention, so although the police 4 may assist we're not looking at an arrest mode, we're 5 looking at helping somebody who has got a medical incident going on, or the person could even be a victim 6 7 of a crime, you know, they have just managed to escape 8 from having been a hostage for -- somewhere, they're 9 still coming off the effect of drugs which they have 10 maybe been given, so it's not always -- it's not always a clear distinction between what you're dealing with. 11 12 You've got to be prepared for who is this person that 13 you're dealing with, as much signs as you can get and 14 warning signs off the person, whereas if it's purely 15 then that you're thinking "This is arrest mode", the other issues might then be secondary rather than 16 17 thinking the primary objective with this is, you know, 18 a mental health crisis which the police are assisting 19 with, or is it a primary objective of an arrest for 20 a serious offence, or is it a victim that we need to 21 help -- that they need to help.

Q. So a reasonable officer is still at this stage considering is this a medical matter, or would it be exclusively a criminal matter?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And what would be the benefits of being a little closer 2 to the subject compared to the remote rendezvous point? So the closer you are, the more you can pick up on the 3 Α. 4 face, so although from a further distance you can see 5 from the behaviours a lot of indicators, but the more that you can physically see the face, the more 6 7 information that's going to give in relation to --8 you know, is the face interactive or not, or is it like 9 a paralysis where the face is just numb, not moving, 10 very little movement there, or is there something physical with the face, do we have what looks like 11 12 a head injury, do we have the eyes bulging in relation 13 to potential injuries or mental illness. So it's about 14 trying to see as much as possible on the face in 15 relation to again, feeding that in and thinking "Which way are we swinging in relation to what is this 16 a response for?" 17 18 So is a reasonable officer always trying to gather in Q. 19 more information about the subject and what the cause of 20 this call is? 21 Α. Definitely, because that's going to increase or reduce 22 risk when you start dealing with the person and it might 23 impact your methodology of how to deal with the person as well, who you're going to get to deal with the 24

25 person, so officers are trained from the beginning to

1 take in as much as possible and think about are any of these tick lists being -- you know, these risk factors 2 being ticked or not and if we're getting numerous ticks, 3 4 in which list are they in. Are they more in the 5 criminal list or the medical list or the mental health crisis list? 6 7 Q. Would a reasonable officer place a limit of time on this observing and waiting and feedback? 8 No, no. The only time factor would be if the risk and 9 Α. 10 threat shifts to then cause like significant -- imminent harm to someone. That would be the pressure, but other 11 12 than that there's no time limit involved in this. We have heard about -- I think we touched on it 13 Q. earlier -- the CUT principle --14 15 Α. Yes. 16 -- where we have heard that you can use cover. It may Q. be suggested that even looking into that situation when 17 18 officers move away from just the observing, the waiting 19 and the feedback, they could use that vehicle for cover; is that a reasonable option? 20 21 Α. The safest method is keeping your door locked in the car 22 and approach, and if need be that you just open the 23 window slightly because even if you open the door and think "Well, I will use the door as cover", if the 24 person moves forward quickly you haven't got time to get 25

1 in and shut the door, so by keeping the door closed and 2 locked it gives you that time as well to see if it 3 there's going to be any reaction from the person, are 4 they going to try and get into the police car and get 5 you out, so whilst you're in the vehicle you're safe and 6 you can also evade the area. 7 To what extent would a reasonable officer be wanting to Q. 8 protect themselves and their colleagues, keep them safe? Yes, I mean, ultimately it needs to be a safe -- all 9 Α. 10 actions need to be as safe as possible, so there will always be an element of danger when you can't avoid 11 12 that, but as far as possible you need to try and avoid 13 unnecessary risk so that then would depend on everything 14 going on and can you approach it -- if it's going to be 15 an approach, can you approach it and keep safety in 16 mind. And again, would observing and waiting permit 17 Q. 18 an opportunity for a reasonable officer to wait for 19 specialist resources to arrive? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. And maybe further support from other units arriving? 22 Α. Yes. 23 We have heard evidence from Martin Graves that he took Q. the view that this type of option, the observe, wait and 24 25 feed back, was open to reasonable officers and is it

1		fair to say you agree with him on that?
2	Α.	Yes, I agree.
3	Q.	And he also talked about the benefits of the additional
4		time that you have described and you agree with him on
5		that?
6	A.	Yes, I agree.
7	Q.	Because I have asked you that question I have realised
8		I didn't ask you that in relation to the first scenario,
9		so I know this is out of order but do you mind if we go
10		back to the rendezvous point.
11	Α.	Okay.
12	Q.	And we heard some evidence from Martin Graves in
13		relation to a marshal in a rendezvous point. Do you
14		want to explain the distinction there?
15	A.	Yes, so you don't need a marshal at a temporary
16		rendezvous point; your marshal is connected to your
17		forward control points, so where your RVP becomes a more
18		permanent or semi-permanent feature and that's then
19		where your marshal is directing people you know,
20		"Police to that end, ambulance crews that end,
21		fire brigade this end", so you muster your troops there,
22		so that's the forward control point to then move to the
23		incident scene from.
24	Q.	Subject to that distinction, where Martin Graves
25		appeared to describe the rendezvous point as

1		available an option available for reasonable
2		officers, you would agree with him to that extent?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	Thank you. Sorry I didn't ask you that earlier.
5	Α.	Rendezvous points can be two seconds.
6	Q.	Right. And just going back to the second scenario, the
7		observe, wait, feed back, if there are warning signs
8		that a person is either intoxicated through drink or
9		drugs, or suffering a mental health crisis, what would
10		a reasonable officer do?
11	Α.	Then it's about getting the ambulance crews coming,
12		because ultimately you're going to need to take that
13		person to hospital and as far as practicable, the person
14		should always be transferred in an ambulance rather than
15		a police vehicle, unless it's not practical to wait for
16		the ambulance crew.
17		Now, the police might need to travel in the
18		ambulance with the person as well for the safety of all
19		involved, but the primary transport method is always the
20		medical model with medical staff there because
21		police officers are not medical. All they can do is
22		look at indicators, so those risk markers.
23	Q.	And what's the benefit to the subject if he is
24		transported in an ambulance as opposed to $$
25	Α.	Well, hopefully then they're getting the care and

1 attention that they need, plus we've got then fully equipped ambulances which can cater for transportation 2 3 of a person on the stretcher, the medical seats, rather 4 than in the back of a police van in handcuffs. 5 And there's no medical supplies in the back of the car? Q. There's no medical supplies in the police vehicle; 6 Α. 7 there's hopefully ones in the ambulance. 8 Yes, all right, thank you. Q. 9 I would like to move on to a third scenario and this 10 scenario is the first, really, where there's engagement with the officers, and I'm going to call this 11 12 de-escalation. 13 Α. Yes. And I will describe this to you as a scenario where 14 Q. 15 a tactical option of engage and negotiate and de-escalate. Unarmed officers attend a location. 16 They 17 are trying to understand what is going on, which would 18 then allow them to inform decision-making about the 19 process. They would provide additional updates to ACR 20 and other officers. It would provide them with various 21 options, such as the opportunity to communicate. It would be a key to building rapport. They would attempt 22 to de-escalate, engage and negotiate. 23 24 Mm-hm. Α.

25 Q. A type of situation where there was engagement with the

subject, they're not sitting in a vehicle in any position, they're actually approaching the subject in some way and in relation to that type of scenario I'm interested in whether you consider that option would be open to reasonable officers who are approaching a subject in the scenario we have described, grade 1 knife incident.

8 Yes, definitely, but you could even commence the Α. 9 communication through the open window, you know, as in 10 "Hey, are you okay?" and just to get the response from 11 how is the person going to respond to any attempt to 12 communicate whilst you're still in the vehicle, so it 13 doesn't have to be a case that you can't speak to the 14 person and try and build rapport unless you're out of 15 the vehicle, it can start from that point. Then if a person turns round and goes "No, I'm all right, I'm 16 17 all right, just a bit wound up", or not, or they might 18 instantly go into a violent attack on the police 19 vehicle.

20 Q. So again, the engagement at that stage could be simple 21 open questions --

22 A. Mm-hm.

23 Q. -- about how the person is?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Can you describe in terms of what a reasonable officer

1 would do, what tone they would use, what their body 2 language, their demeanour would be like? I think the reasonable officer would look at trying to 3 Α. 4 come in low, knowing then that they've got flexibility 5 to suddenly increase the response. As I mentioned earlier, it's difficult if you go in at a high level to 6 7 come down, so it's -- certainly officers are trained if 8 there's any suspicion of mental crisis, mental health crisis, or medical, it's about being calm with the 9 10 voice, keeping it quiet, offering assistance and not being sharp to frighten the person into -- because a lot 11 12 of people might, if they're in crisis, be frightened of 13 the police, just the physical uniform can send the 14 anxieties there, so it's about trying to be calm and 15 going, you know, "Hello, hey up", whatever, whatever 16 local --In a Scottish accent? 17 Q. 18 Yes, whatever local phrase is used within that area, but Α. 19 just something to try and indicate you come in peace, to help, that you're not coming as an aggressor. 20 What circumstances in that situation would give rise to 21 Q. 22 a suspicion in the mind of a reasonable officer that this was a mental health crisis? Could you give us 23 examples? 24 Yes, so if the person -- if they're not -- if their 25 Α.

1 behaviour is unusual, so like, the clothing, the lashing out at things, talking -- talking to nobody, or into 2 3 open air, so we've got behaviour, then physically the 4 bulging of the eyes, that would indicate either mental 5 health crisis and/or some form of intoxication, staring through people, so if you're not actually correctly 6 7 focusing, because often if you're talking to a person --8 a lot of people even in mental health crisis can talk quite freely back depending on what the crisis is, but 9 10 sometimes you will see their eye focus point isn't there, they're either looking right through you or 11 12 there's no change in their eye contact and again, I'm 13 not a healthcare professional to identify what that 14 means, but that would be a tick of concern to go, 15 "I need a healthcare professional to look at this and tell me is this relevant". 16

Q. And for a reasonable officer, if he or she sees any signs giving rise to a concern that it may be a mental health crisis or intoxication of some sort, when you say a reasonable officer would be saying "I need healthcare assistance" --

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. -- what does that mean?

A. Ambulance at the scene there, or if it got to it and the person was being arrested, it would be healthcare upon

1 arrival at the station, and a lot of the time the reasonable custody sergeant would -- as soon as they 2 3 have heard that -- go "No, you go straight to hospital", 4 because he is trying to avoid -- if there's a risk 5 factor, it's trying to keep that person out of the system until they're safe to come into the system, and 6 7 the only way of classifying if the person's potentially 8 safe to come into the system is by the healthcare 9 professional. 10 Q. So I think you said earlier this morning a healthcare 11 professional can assess the person and make a decision 12 about their wellbeing, effectively? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Right. And what are the benefits of this scenario, this Q. 15 third de-escalation scenario, the engage and negotiate and de-escalate, for a reasonable officer? 16 Again, it's giving you more information in relation to 17 Α. 18 that NDM and to feed then into the policies and powers to then be thinking about which SOP or which legislation 19 20 am I going down with this because you might still be 21 unsure where you're going with this. Plus it gives you 22 that opportunity to try and build that rapport with the 23 person as well because you don't want a person to be 24 thinking about violence towards you because at the end 25 of the day, the officers as well all want to go home

1		safe that day, so it's about trying to keep everything
2		as calm as possible and to try and minimise escalation
3		of violence.
4	Q.	What if an officer a reasonable officer is looking at
5		the subject but is unsure whether it is a mental health
6		crisis
7	A.	Yes, then radio. So you would be passing back to the
8		control room "This is what I'm seeing; advice, please".
9	Q.	So they can also seek advice from the inspector?
10	A.	Yes, yes.
11	Q.	And then it's open to the inspector or the PIO or
12		a sergeant to
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	provide that advice?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	What advice would you expect a reasonable supervisor to
17		be giving if the officer is uncertain whether it's
18		a mental health crisis?
19	A.	So I think if they're passing things about the eyes and
20		the behaviour
21	Q.	Yes?
22	A.	I think then the reasonable supervisor is likely to say
23		"This needs a medical intervention", as in: we need to
24		deploy an ambulance, get an ambulance to the scene,
25		because there's it's quite common where an ambulance

1		will go to a scene and check someone over before they're
2		then brought to custody and then at custody, because
3		they have already been checked at the scene, the
4		embedded healthcare professional will then further
5		assess them and then decide do they need to go to the
6		hospital or can they continue with them at the custody.
7	Q.	So you have explained the position if a reasonable
8		officer is clearly convinced that this is a mental
9		health crisis, they would seek medical intervention.
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	If a reasonable officer is unsure but seeking that
12		clarification
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	would that also be something that
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	would probably result in an ambulance being obtained?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	Maybe not by the officer, or sought by the officer, but
19		by the supervisors?
20	A.	Yes, because I think if the constable who is dealing
21		with the person has got suspicions that there might be
22		mental health, or health, then that's enough then to say
23		"This is no longer just business as usual, we have now
24		got suspected mental health, we need someone with
25		medical training to actually now look."

Q. And what difference would it make if rather than mental
 health issues, it was an issue about intoxication
 through drink or drugs? Would any of the evidence you
 have given alter in any way?

5 No, because same again, the intoxication through drink Α. or drugs are specified conditions, the same as mental 6 7 health, head injuries and angina, so as a specified 8 condition they need to be advised upon by a healthcare 9 professional, so the level of intoxication is important 10 to establish whether -- even if it's a criminal matter, they might still not be safe to go to custody, to the 11 12 actual custody unit, they might still need to be taken 13 to hospital and officers remain at hospital with them 14 until they are deemed to be low enough intoxication and 15 safe enough to then be dealt with by non-healthcare staff in a custody unit. 16

Q. Thank you. To what extent does this form of engagement
with a subject permit a reasonable officer
an opportunity to make an assessment about the demeanour
and the behaviour of the subject?

A. It gives a really good one. Sometimes that moment of
being closer can give a lot of rapid suspicion of risk
factors, because there's just something you think "Well,
it's just something -- this person just isn't presenting
how I would expect an average normal member of the

1 public today to be presenting". We have also heard that officers in this situation would 2 Q. 3 wish to -- where maybe they couldn't see a knife, they 4 would wish to maintain a reactionary gap? 5 Definitely, definitely, yes. Α. And what difference, if any, would it make if the 6 Q. 7 subject is non-verbal, so not communicating verbally 8 with the officers? That, for me, would indicate more risk factors because 9 Α. 10 you're thinking then why are they not speaking? Is it 11 an inability to speak through maybe a disability, in 12 which case, this could be even more frightening because 13 maybe they can't hear as well. Are they not speaking 14 because of impact of intoxication, drink or drugs, in 15 which case if they can't speak, then they need medical help, because they're at such a level of intoxication, 16 17 or is it the mental health aspect why they can't speak 18 and either way, the communication then from the officers 19 is going to be difficult because it's a barrier to 20 communication if that person either has any impacted 21 hearing ability or speech ability. 22 So essentially all of these factors would be going Q. through the head of a reasonable officer and would 23 a reasonable officer then be feeding back to ACR? 24 25 Α. Yes.

1	Q.	And I think we have heard from Martin Graves in relation
2		to this option and he I'm wondering if you agree with
3		him that this is an option open to reasonable officers
4		if circumstances permit?
5	A.	Yes.
6	Q.	I would like to move on to the fourth scenario, please.
7		This is a scenario that I'm calling verbal dominance.
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	It's an authoritarian approach, wanting to try and
10		control the individual. Verbal dominance approach of
11		communication. A methodology of trying to dominate the
12		individual by getting them to comply with your
13		instructions, to minimise the risk, or minimise the
14		requirement to possibly use other force, and we have
15		heard in evidence that this has been described as a hard
16		stop.
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	And this was a description of a tactical option
19		articulated by Martin Graves in his Inquiry statement,
20		so you may have read about this scenario?
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	For reasonable officers attending a knife incident such
23		as we have described, would this option be open to
24		reasonable officers?
25	A.	It would be open if the preclusion existed for the other

1 things have either been attempted and failed, or
2 deemed -- because of the imminent risk -- they weren't
3 feasible to attempt.

4 Tell us about this principle of preclusion? Q. 5 So it's about looking at -- you're always trying to look Α. at what is the lowest level of force that I can use and 6 7 force -- use of force isn't just about the physical use of force. The moment you draw a baton or CS, that is 8 a use of force, it's a level of force that you're using 9 10 because there's the threat impact effect there, so you 11 don't actually have to hit someone with your baton for 12 it to be a use of force by the baton. Simply 13 withdrawing it is still a methodology of use of force.

14 So sometimes time will be an impact. So if the 15 person -- if a person is running at you now with a knife in their hands, I have a split second to decide -- none 16 17 of this like verbal intervention -- none of it is likely 18 to work because I need to stop the momentum of the 19 person suddenly running at you, but if they're at the 20 other end of the room and they've got the knife or 21 another weapon and then they're going, "I might go and 22 kill Angela", then I've got some opportunity there to 23 go, "Do you think that's a wise option?"--24 Q. Okay.

25 A. -- or whatever, but you've got some opportunity there,

1		so it's all about looking at time factors, level of
2		risk, the imminency of it, so is it about to happen now,
3		or is it in the near future; is it going to create any
4		additional or increased risk by whatever option I decide
5		to do or not do because an action is also an inaction,
6		so there's pros and cons with action or inaction.
7	Q.	So again, it very much depends on the particular
8		circumstances which are facing a reasonable officer at
9		any given time?
10	A.	Yes, and it's making those rapid decisions of
11		thinking: what is the right option at this time and, as
12		you mentioned before, two officers might have
13		a different viewpoint on what option is the best option,
14		but ultimately, if your decision-making is there, then
15		it's more likely to be evidenced and hopefully work out
16		than if there's no decision-making there.
17	Q.	And in terms of if a reasonable officer adopts this type
18		of tactical approach, of verbal dominance, what impact
19		does that have on their other options that may be open
20		to them or the time they have to consider other options?
21	Α.	If you come in at verbal dominance, you're quite high up
22		on the communication aspect, so there's less chance then
23		of going into nurturing mode, you're basically at that
24		critical parent didactic particular mode, so you have
25		begun a chain of events on the communication level, so

1 it's difficult to go from being that dominant person to then going to "Can I help you? Do you want to talk 2 3 about it?" 4 That doesn't stop another officer stepping in and 5 being good cop, bad cop scenario and sometimes that can 6 help as then a way of de-escalating. 7 So officers perhaps arriving slightly later at the scene Q. 8 still have that option open to them to try the de-escalation method? 9 10 Α. Yes, because the person might now have a barrier to communicate to me if I was trying to be dominant to you, 11 12 but another officer then arriving who took a more 13 nurturing approach, you might instantly warm to them, 14 but it's difficult for me to create a rapport now with 15 you because that's been damaged. Q. So more difficult for that reasonable officer, but still 16 something that they could attempt to try? 17 18 Α. Yes, still something that can be attempted, but just 19 more difficult. 20 So it would still remain a reasonable option for other Q. 21 officers who have not got that situation. 22 Α. Yes. 23 In terms of permitting a reasonable officer time to Q. engage and communicate or build a rapport with the 24 25 subject, how does verbal dominance as an approach impact

1 on that?

2 It doesn't really give you the opportunity to build Α. 3 a rapport because you have gone straight into didactic 4 mode, so that does bring up a lot of barriers. You 5 would have to then work harder to get those barriers down over longer-term, but time-wise it would all be 6 7 dependent on the people involved as well and could --8 the person who started off in a dominant role, do they 9 even have the time then to try and go into a nurturing 10 mode and then would that person actually go that easy to think "Well, okay then, now you're being nice", so it 11 12 could create barriers, but each individual, whether it 13 be the officer or the subject, it's personal to them as 14 to length of time.

15 Q. And this approach of verbal dominance, what impact would that have on the ability or the time of the officer to 16 17 take in additional information about the subject, their appearance, their behaviour, their demeanour? 18 I think what it's likely to do is create a quicker 19 Α. 20 response back from the person and so that can give --21 that cuts down your time then to gather information, but 22 it could escalate the person quickly one way or the 23 other, as to they escalate up in their response, or instantly go "I give up". I haven't seen many people 24 25 ever say "I give up". It usually impacts the use of

1 force, usually --2 And when you say impact, you mean increase, escalate? Q. 3 As in it's more likely to increase and escalate, yes, Α. 4 because you will often find the person then, the subject 5 will either respond in a forward motion at the officers, or try and suddenly escape, so then you've got a bit of 6 7 a chase on and use of force. That's from my experience 8 that I have seen those different methodologies being attempted. 9 10 Q. And if a reasonable officer used verbal dominance, what impact would that have on their opportunity to assess 11 12 whether it was a mental health matter, a health issue, 13 or an arrest issue? 14 Potentially it's going to reduce the chance -- the time, Α. 15 so you are more likely then -- you've got your evidence from prior to that verbal dominance and then whatever 16 17 happens after the verbal dominance, but it's removed a section of time. Now, that section of time, you know, 18 19 could be short, could be long, but by trying to -- if 20 you've got the opportunity to engage with the person a 21 bit and establish more communication or lack of 22 communication, it just then gives you more information feeding into the NDM. 23 And that can then be fed back to ACR? 24 Q.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And are there any circumstances -- and you may have already answered this actually -- where you feel that 2 3 this approach would not be one that a reasonable officer 4 would consider open to them on arrival at an incident? 5 I think when you arrive at a scene if you start thinking Α. that what you're dealing with is mental health crisis, 6 7 I think the reasonable officer would go down the line of 8 trying communication and de-escalation that way. If you 9 have arrived at the scene and you think a crime is 10 imminent, so the person is about to stab someone, then you're going to go more to the verbal dominance because 11 12 you want that crime in motion to stop, or that crime 13 that's about to happen. Thank you. Can we look at -- well, I should say --14 Q. 15 I think I said at the outset -- we heard from 16 Martin Graves and he said this is an option open to 17 officers --18 Α. Yes. 19 -- reasonable officers, depending on the circumstances. Q. 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. Would you agree with that in principle? Yes, yes. 22 Α. 23 Thank you. Can we look at the use of force SOP now, Q. 24 please. It will come up on the screen, it's PS10933. 25 This is the use of force standard operating procedure

1 and if we look at 2.2 to 2.7, just up the screen --2 thank you. 2.2: 3 "Any force used by a Police Officer or member of Police Staff must be legal, proportionate, and 4 5 reasonable in the circumstances and the minimum amount necessary to accomplish the lawful objective concerned." 6 7 Do you understand that principle? 8 Α. Yes, yes. 9 And could you explain what it means by the minimum Q. 10 amount necessary to accomplish the lawful objective? Yes, so there, for example, if a person was urinating in 11 Α. 12 a doorway, it would be completely disproportionate to 13 taser them. It might be an annoying act, but it's 14 completely disproportionate to what's happening. So 15 it's looking at can you avoid the use of force 16 altogether, simply by your mere presence. You know, 17 sometimes the officer's physical presence, or a warning 18 from them, verbal warning, pleading with them to like 19 "Stop what you're doing now" -- so I'm not talking about 20 the urinating now, just any incident. 21 Q. No. 22 So those initial engagements in addition to your Α. 23 physical presence. Can you even get in-between people,

so if you see, for example, two people are squaring up

outside a pub or a club, then you will quite often see

25

24

1 officers getting in-between, hands up and saying "Back off", or you might see then a push and like just a small 2 3 push "Back off", so all the time they're looking at can 4 this be avoided altogether with this minimum amount of 5 force, but then if the person comes to attack, how are you then going to deal with the person and then that's 6 7 where, for example, you're taught the colour coding of 8 the body system to understand risk factors and which then would be the safer body parts to target. 9 10 Q. Can I ask you what it means about accomplishing a lawful 11 objective? 12 Yes, so the lawful objective there would be like Α. a lawful arrest, so are you using the force for a lawful 13 arrest, or does it end up being an unlawful arrest. 14 15 Q. And then 2.3: "Action must be proportionate ..." 16 Which you have just described: 17 18 "... in relation to the competing rights of 19 individuals and any force used should be no more than is 20 absolutely necessary. In this regard individual 21 officers and staff must be prepared to account for their 22 decisions and to show that they were justified. It is recognised as good practice for police officers and 23 staff to record details in their notebooks of all 24 instances involving the use of force and the reasons why 25

1 force was necessary."

2 If I can ask you some questions about this. You 3 have mentioned the first sentence about being 4 proportionate. Where it says "Individual officers must 5 be prepared to account for their decisions and show that they were justified", what does that mean? 6 7 It's showing that every officer is responsible for their Α. 8 use of force as an individual, so if I, as a police 9 officer, was using force against someone and then a colleague turned up, just because I'm using force 10 11 against that person doesn't necessarily mean that they 12 have -- that the colleague coming has the right to use 13 force, they need to make their own decisions in relation to whether they use force or not. 14 Q. Does this tie in with what you said a moment ago about 15 if an officer has used verbal dominance, that may 16 17 preclude them from de-escalating and moving back to 18 a different --19 Yes. Α. 20 -- more communicative form of tactical option, but Q. 21 a separate officer approaching would have all those 22 options remain open to them? Yes, yes, so they can use tactics which are different. 23 Α. Q. And then as well as individual officers justifying their 24 25 actions, to what extent would a reasonable officer

1		consider they had to justify each use of force?
2	A.	Yes, so if, for example, a scenario where two people
3		have been squaring up, your first use of force is maybe
4		the small push, they still don't move so then you come
5		back and you give them a next push, and again, you have
6		to justify that one. So then if they decide, well,
7		they're walking off but then you decide you're going to
8		chase them down and handcuff them, you have to justify
9		that one, so the first two might be justifiable, but
10		then the third one isn't.
11	Q.	And equally, if you have multiple strikes with a baton,
12		is it the responsibility of a reasonable officer to
13		justify each strike?
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	Dependent on the circumstances that exist at that
16		moment?
17	Α.	Yes, yes.
18	Q.	And where it says it's good practice to record details
19		in notebooks of all incidents involving the use of force
20		and the reasons why force was necessary, can you tell us
21		a little about that?
22	A.	So every officer has a pocket notebook, and that pocket
23		notebook needs to record significant events as their
24		aide memoire, so any use of force that you have used,
25		even if that's just you have drawn your equipment, it's

1 achieved the objective, you haven't had to physically use it, you would still make a note of this because the 2 3 person could still then, for example, make a complaint 4 in relation to the police use of force to move them on 5 from an area, for example. Describe the type of note that you would expect 6 Q. 7 a reasonable officer to make in their notebook? So there at the left -- your notebooks generally have 8 Α. 9 a margin down the left-hand side so that's where you 10 write the time. Then the first line would be the location and then you might be putting there "Dealing 11 12 with a group of people, two of them squaring up, male 1, 13 6-foot tall, blonde hair, blue eyes. Person 2, female, 14 dark hair, stated she was the wife of male 1", or -- so 15 you put a little bit of a description there as well for that and then in effect what you did, or what advice 16 that you give. 17 18 And while we're on this subject we have also heard some Q. 19 evidence about use of force forms --20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. -- that should be completed by officers? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Do you have any experience of that type of scenario? Q. Yes. Yes, basically by the end of your shift you're 24 Α. expected to put in your use of force forms by the end of 25

1 that shift, but it was permissible within the next 2 24 hours before your next shift, but they were looking 3 at by the end of that shift you put them in, so some 4 nights you could put several in for the one shift, 5 especially on a night shift, because if you have been using handcuffs for transportation of people in from 6 7 locations as well, you would need to be putting the use 8 of force form in for the fact that you have decided to 9 restrain them and why, so the form asks about what the 10 risk assessment, the reasons for handcuffing, so yes, some officers could end up putting multiple forms in per 11 12 shift or per week. 13 We have also heard some evidence about use of spray Q. 14 forms --15 Α. Yes. -- and a legal requirement which came in 16 Q. in April 2013 --17 18 Α. Yes. 19 -- that they be completed within 24 hours? Q. 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. And in Scotland, at least sent to PIRC, the Police 22 Investigations and Review Commissioner, and that would be sent via the OST email address and then passed to 23 PIRC. Is that something you're aware of as well? 24 Yes. At the time when I was policing, the use of force 25 Α.

1		form that we had covered the CS as well, it wasn't
2		a separate one, but I believe most forces now have gone
3		to a separate one for the CS, or PAVA.
4	Q.	Do you have any knowledge of if forms aren't completed
5		by officers, so use of force forms or use of spray
6		forms, what arrangements are made to ensure completion
7		of those forms?
8	Α.	Well, it's a mandate that they're put in, so usually
9		then the supervisor is on the team member before the end
10		of that shift to be saying "Where's your use of force
11		form?" because typically the paperwork will go through
12		the sergeant if it's hard copy; if it's electronic copy
13		I don't know what safeguards Police Scotland had in
14		place for the sergeant to know that they have put an
15		electronic copy in, but certainly the paper copies would
16		always come through the sergeant when I was there.
17	Q.	So for a constable the supervisor would be a sergeant?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	And for the sergeant?
20	Α.	It would be the inspector.
21	Q.	The inspector would be the supervisor. We may hear more
22		evidence about this in due course.
23		To go back to the SOP, do we see at 2.4:
24		"An arrest should be made as unobtrusively as
25		possible. In no circumstances must a prisoner be

harshly treated or have greater force used towards that
 person than is absolutely necessary to restrain them."
 A. Yes.

4 Q. Can you explain what that means?

5 Yes, so that's complying with some of the European Α. human rights for safer custody, whereby whether the 6 detainee is police or prison -- it's about use of force 7 8 and arresting unobtrusively, so, for example, you don't 9 overtly go into somebody's workplace and arrest them, or 10 into the public -- you would ask them if -- depending on the risk "Do you mind stepping outside", and then if 11 12 they start saying ,"I'm not stepping outside", you say, 13 "Well, you either step outside to be arrested or we're 14 going to arrest you in here", so it's looking at 15 wherever possible can it be done subtly and likewise, it 16 is recommended that you don't arrest children at school 17 and again, it's just about trying to remove some of that 18 stigma from them being arrested there.

19 Q. So it's not even to the extent about using force to do 20 that, it's using that subtly, as you put it --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- or discreetly?

A. Yes, so you don't make a big show of it and put
spotlights on people because at the end of the day for
what they're being arrested for, they might be innocent.

1 And then about the issues about being harshly treated, so that -- if it's excessive use of force then that 2 3 would breach the European Conventions in relation to use 4 of force with detainees, that it's not overly used, it's 5 not used excessively in volume, so even though the force in itself might not be excessive per se, but if it's 6 7 a volume that's unnecessary then that could be that. 8 It also looks at the issues around medical treatment, so that the general principle is medical 9 10 treatment is without restraints unless the risk assessment shows that they have to have them. 11 12 Q. Can we move on, please, to paragraph 2.5: "The decision to use any defensive technique or 13 14 equipment in a confrontational situation is for each 15 individual to assess based on the circumstances involved." 16 17 And I think you have said, Ms Caffrey, and also we have heard that the particular circumstances are 18 significant to any decision that's made? 19 20 A. Yes. And it might depend on the individual demographics 21 of the officer involved. You know, if the person is 22 a lot bigger and stronger than you, or you fear that they're a lot stronger than you by the size and 23 24 behaviour presented, then if that officer then feels 25 they need equipment in order to defend themselves and

1 that there's no option but to defend themselves because 2 let's say, for example, they're up against the wall and 3 there's no way for them to create space and carry on 4 using verbal, so they might then have to use their 5 equipment, but it's about where necessary. Defensive tactic, if you have to use it, then you've got your 6 7 tools available to look at what are you going to use, 8 why, and then what methodology are you going to use with 9 that. 10 Q. Thank you. And then if we can move down the page slightly and look at 2.6 and 2.7. 2.6, first of all: 11 12 "Indiscriminate or unnecessary use of force is 13 unacceptable and individuals will be personally 14 accountable for such improper use. There are only two 15 criteria for any use of physical force, those being: "Justification: where the force used is reasonable 16 and proportionate to the perceived threat; and 17 18 "Preclusion: where other reasonable response options 19 have, either, been attempted and failed or are 20 considered to be inappropriate." 21 Α. Yes. 22 So again, you have touched on this earlier, but looking Q. at justification, first of all --23 Yes, so this would link in with, you know, days gone by 24 Α. 25 where there might be large gatherings of people and

1 a little bit of disorder happening but you would see police running in with truncheons just indiscriminately 2 3 hitting out at people and then innocent people who were 4 there just to watch, were not offering violence, are 5 then struck. So that would link in with those kind of examples and preclusion there -- it's about looking at 6 7 what's reasonable in the circumstances. You're not 8 going to taser someone who has been at a minor disorder level. 9 10 Q. Yes. And 2.7 finally: "The overriding principle is that any force used by 11 12 ... Officers and ... Staff must never be excessive. Any 13 force used must be reasonable based on the individual 14 person's perception of the threat that they are 15 immediately facing." I'm interested in this phrase "The individual 16 person's perception of the threat that they are 17 immediately facing". Do you have any comments on that? 18 19 Again, it would take into account things like Α. 20 demographics, background, your own level of knowledge 21 and competency, whether incidents have happened in the

22 past which then make you fear that that's a potential 23 risk that you're going to experience. It's very much 24 down on the individual officers to justify why the 25 threat and risk that they were being posed they

1 considered to be, you know, disproportionate for the 2 response coming back or not. Q. And let's look at 4.6 now, please. We will see that 3 4 this is a paragraph entitled "Profiled Offender Behaviour": 5 "This term encompasses the actions and behaviour of 6 7 the subject and comprise of the Warning and Danger signs 8 they exhibit coupled with Impact Factors. Profiling 9 a person's behaviour may assist in determining 10 an officer's reasonable response. Profiled Offender Behaviour can be sub-categorised ... " 11 12 And as we go down the page do we see that those 13 categories are split into, I think, six levels? Yes. 14 Α. 15 And we can take it -- so they go from "Compliance" at Q. level 1, right through to level 6 "Serious/Aggravated 16 Assaultive Resistance". 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 Are you familiar with all these categories? Q. Yes, they're similar across the UK and different 20 Α. 21 sectors. And then 4.7 -- we have heard evidence about these 22 Q. 23 different categories, I won't go through that with you 24 at the moment. 4.7 is an "Officers Reasonable Response 25 (Force Options)", and it says:

"By combining the elements of Profiled Offender 1 Behaviour and Impact Factors it afterwards the 2 3 officer/staff the ability to quickly assess the threat 4 and to make an informed decision to adopt appropriate 5 tactics from a range of force Options in order to deal with the situation in a controlled justifiable and 6 7 accountable manner. These responses (force options) can 8 be sub-categorised." 9 And again, do we see that these have been 10 categorised into levels 1, officer presence; level 2, tactical communications; 3, control skills; 4, defensive 11 12 tactics and 5, deadly or lethal force. 13 Mm-hm. Α. Again, are you familiar with these categories? 14 Q. 15 Α. Yes, yes. And can we go back up to the beginning of 4.7. 16 Q. 17 Obviously the word "Justifiable", you have talked about "justify" and "justified", but it also mentions here 18 "accountable manner": what's that about? 19 20 So this is looking at -- for example, if you're Α. 21 interfering with someone's human rights and entitlements 22 to be able to move freely around the street but you're 23 now stopping them simply by your physical presence, can 24 you account -- can you justify it and can you account 25 for it, so it's often balancing rights of one against

1		rights of another as well and whether use of force is
2		applicable, or your intervention rather than any just
3		use of force.
4	Q.	And in terms of providing a justification for choosing
5		a use of force, you may recall as you have watched
6		Martin Graves' evidence he said it's not just justifying
7		that particular use of force, but also why you didn't
8		choose an alternative lower method?
9	Α.	Yes, yes.
10	Q.	You agree with that?
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	And we have also heard that the use of force SOP is an
13		important SOP?
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	And that the principles behind this are mirrored in the
16		manual for training officers and also if we could
17		look at that for a moment, we have seen the 2013 manual,
18		PS11538A, and I believe you have had sight of this
19		before your evidence today.
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	And if we could look at page 5, it talks about use of
22		force, justification and preclusion, so again the same
23		principles from the use of force SOP are
24	A.	Yes.
25	Q.	being repeated here and then at the very bottom

1		right-hand side column there do we see:
2		"Two officers confronted with the same set of
3		circumstances may react differently. They may select
4		different force options each of which they perceived to
5		be appropriate and reasonable for them. It is for each
6		officer to justify their individual course of action."
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	So again, seeing those phrases and words reflected
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	and mirrored in the manual?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	And if we can look finally at a PowerPoint, COPFS05973,
13		and we have heard this is a PowerPoint used for officer
14		safety training, slide 7 and slide 8, please.
15		Sorry, keep going. That's perfect, thank you. It
16		says here "Criteria for use of force", "Justification":
17		"The level of force used must be reasonable for the
18		resistance exhibited by the subject."
19		And preclusion again is repeated here on the slide.
20		We have heard that these are key issues being brought
21		out in the PowerPoint slide.
22	A.	Yes.
23	Q.	Could I see the preceding one and this one I'm not
24		yes. And then we see here "Use of Force":
25		"Force must only be used when it is:

1		"Reasonable
2		"An absolute necessity.
3		"The minimum amount necessary.
4		"Proportionate"
5		And:
6		"Officers must be accountable [and] show a legal
7		basis for their actions."
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	Can I touch on perception before we move on. To what
10		extent is perception a factor when one is carrying
11		out a reasonable officer is doing the NDM and
12		carrying out a risk assessment?
13	Α.	Well, certainly it's something to take into
14		consideration but the officer still has to justify their
15		action or inaction, because collectively,
16		police officers have such a varied background even prior
17		to joining the police and then in the police different
18		postings will give them different experiences, different
19		capabilities, different competencies, then we've got age
20		factors, and we've got maybe where it's gone wrong,
21		different they will experiences of trying things,
22		it's gone wrong, trying things, it's worked, their own
23		personal history of being assaulted, so officers will be
24		considering all of this, but that doesn't mean to say
25		that that's the only factor to consider. It's something

1		else to take into consideration but you still need to be
2		objective with the facts and risks as presented and as
3		known, but your background in relation to what this
4		might be could then feed extra information into that
5		information and intelligence as the first step.
6	Q.	So would it be open for the Chair to consider it is
7		still appropriate for him to consider the reasonableness
8		of any perception
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	that is stated.
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	Thank you. And we have heard from Martin Graves that
13		the four options we discussed are open to officers; you
14		agree with that?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	And you agree that they are open to all the individual
17		officers separately?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	Any use of force at any time has to be each
20		individual use of force
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	has to be justified, and would you agree that
23		a reasonable officer will endeavour to observe the
24		preclusion principle in what they do, depending on the
25		circumstances?

1 Α. Yes. 2 I would like to move on now to -- sorry, are you Q. 3 comfortable to continue? Would we need a break? 4 Α. Yes, yes. 5 Yes, thank you. I would like to move on to look at some Q. specific scenarios with you. Where first of all 6 7 officers are attending an incident, we've discussed 8 this, there's an allegation of a knife that the subject 9 has chased cars with that knife? 10 Α. Yes. There's been a call for all units to attend, the 11 Q. 12 sergeant has asked -- sergeant on the ground has asked 13 for a dog unit and an ARV, and I'm going to again be 14 asking you some questions about tactical options that 15 are open to reasonable officers in different scenarios? 16 Α. Yes. 17 So if I can take you to the first officers arriving at Q. 18 the scene, against that background. 19 Α. Yes. 20 And the subject is walking briskly. Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 He is noted by an officer to have eyes bulging out of Q. his head. It's been raining, blowing a gale, the 23 24 subject is wearing a wee T-shirt. 25 Mm-hm. Α.

1 Q. His palms are held out and there is no knife visible but obviously the Airwaves have been inviting officers to --2 3 deploying officers to a knife incident. He is already 4 walking towards officers when they get out of the van 5 and an officer became aware he was high on something. Now, as we go through this scenario I would like to 6 7 have the use of force SOP back on the screen if possible 8 and I would like to go through 4.6 and 4.7, the profiled 9 offender behaviour and the reasonable officer response. 10 So let's start with 4.6. It is profiled offender behaviour and let's start there. So in the circumstance 11 12 I have described to you, what would a reasonable 13 officer's view be in relation to the category of 14 profiled offender behaviour? 15 So at the moment we have just got a person who is going. Α. If the officers then initially engage as in "hey, 16 17 stop" -- do we have some indication first from the officers to establish what is the reaction to that, so 18 if the officers try to engage by saying "Hello", or 19 20 whatever words, if the person then is attempting to --21 well, sorry, if the person then responds in a positive way, as in "Hi officer, how can I help?" then they're 22 fully compliant, they're level 1, they're complying with 23 24 this.

25

But then you might get the person who is then

1 walking on by, so then you're at level 2 because they're 2 not compliant. They may or may not be verbal but 3 certainly if the person then -- you know, it's not 4 uncommon to try and engage with someone who wants to 5 carry on walking by and they may even say like "No, not bothering", or just do a non-verbal hand sign gesture or 6 7 just try and ignore the fact that you have even asked 8 them to stop, and there's many reasons for that lack of 9 engagement initially. It could be either, you know, the 10 person has got hearing difficulties so they haven't heard you, or it could be that the person just doesn't 11 12 like the police, you know, or it could be that the 13 person can't understand because of intoxication or 14 mental illness, or the person is guilty of something and 15 they don't want to engage with the police, so there could be a spectrum of why a person doesn't want to 16 17 engage. 18 Q. Would a reasonable officer have that spectrum of 19 possibilities within their thoughts? 20 I believe so. Because you still want to know why: Α. 21 what's the problem, why -- why aren't you willing to 22 speak to me? I'm trying to engage with you here. And if the subject -- as this scenario I have 23 Q. 24 described -- is eyes bulging out of his head, wearing 25 a T-shirt when it has been raining and blowing a gale

1 that day and the officer is aware he was high on something, can you explain what level of response 2 3 a reasonable officer at that stage would consider 4 appropriate? 5 I think they would be thinking about this is a person Α. who is under the influence of intoxication and/or mental 6 7 illness and I need to get them medical attention, so 8 "Control, we need an ambulance"; "Hey guy, I want to 9 help you, how can I help you", and look at that initial 10 engagement as to can you get a rapport with the person and stress to them "We're here to help", but still 11 12 keeping all the distance because you don't know whether 13 there's a weapon involved or not. Q. So at that stage what are the factors, the key factors 14 15 from the description I have given you that would in your mind alert a reasonable officer to calling for that 16 17 ambulance? 18 Α. Definitely the visual of the eyes bulging. If the face 19 then if it's not looking, it's not responding like 20 normally, the inappropriate clothing for the weather, 21 those factors alone would be thinking "There's something not right here, it --" and you still don't know as 22 a police officer whether it's purely intoxication, 23 24 purely mental health crisis or both, but the fact that 25 you deal with both issues quite a lot would increase

your suspicions that this could be yet another incident
 involving these areas.

Q. And for a reasonable officer, bearing those factors in mind, how long do you think it would take them to contact ACR on the radio and --

It should be very quickly because you want to feed that 6 Α. 7 information back and plus you're trying to then feed 8 back to the control room the nature of what -- so it 9 doesn't negate the fact that a knife has been reported, 10 but it's instantly feeding back that this is a person involving potentially intoxication/mental health crisis, 11 12 which in effect could increase the risk if not handled 13 appropriately.

Q. And thinking about how a reasonable officer would
respond to that risk, potentially a higher risk, what,
in your view, would a reasonable officer be doing after
they have contacted ACR about an ambulance?
A. It then indicates this is going to have additional risk

19factors for police involvement and that would be all the20more reason to hopefully have the dog arriving because21you -- you still need the person to stop and you still22need to find out if they've got a weapon, so that in23effect is involving your stop search powers, but yet if24the weapon is concealed on them then that's putting the25officers at risk to go into that personal space. So you

1		have still got obligations there as well to either
2		negate that risk by finding the weapon and removing it,
3		or demonstrating it's not there, and then in which case
4		if it's not there, one of the key roles of the dog as
5		well is to find discarded items, so if potentially
6		you've got a discarded knife you know then if the dog is
7		coming, the dog's role then is find the knife, or
8		whatever weapon it is before the public finds it and
9		then uses it in another way.
10	Q.	Right. Would it be an option for a reasonable officer
11		at that stage to withdraw?
12	A.	Yes, it would still be an option. It would still be an
13		option.
14	Q.	What does the possibility of the knife, even though it
15		is not visible, what's the possibility what impact
16		does that have on that option in terms of how
17		a reasonable officer would deal with it?
18	A.	It's all about balancing that risk factor and imminent
19		danger, so if you think if there's no knife visible
20		it doesn't mean the knife isn't there, but it also means
21		that the knife could have been discarded because that
22		can happen as well, but it's then looking at is there
23		a necessity to escalate this to if the person isn't
24		willing to stop and comply, do we then increase
25		the police presence to do it by force, or do you back

1 off for the time being, keep observations or even follow 2 the person, carry on walking along with them to still 3 try building rapport but keeping distance. So it's not 4 saying -- you're not going to get into your car and 5 drive off and out of sight. It would still be -- but there is still an option of keeping that distance and 6 7 constantly trying with that either verbal engagement to 8 try and get the rapport, or you might back off a little 9 bit more and just keep close following. 10 Q. Would a reasonable officer consider that it was open to them to continue to attempt to communicate and to 11 12 continue to attempt to build a rapport? Yes, certainly for those immediate tactical objectives 13 Α. 14 because at the minute we've got officers who haven't 15 actually got a given tactical option, so if the tactical option was given that the objective is that person must 16 17 be stop searched for the weapon, then they know they're still aiming for that tactic, but if no tactic has been 18 given and the officers are being left to decide their 19 20 own tactic, then that's going to impact it as well and 21 then they might be thinking "We need more than two 22 officers in order to deal with this because we need to 23 get the person to stop and we need to be able to go through the process such as the stop search", but with 24 25 two officers with a non-compliant person that's going to

1 be more problematic. 2 When you say no tactical option, is this what you were Q. 3 talking about earlier, the benefits of an RVP or 4 observe, wait and feed back, that it creates that 5 opportunity to prepare a tactical option? Yes, and a formal tactical option, so if the supervisor 6 Α. 7 says "The object is by the end of this incident we will have stop searched this person and then we will respond 8 to whatever is found or not" --9 10 Q. And for a reasonable officer in this situation you have 11 said one option would be to continue to attempt to 12 communicate and engage. 13 Α. Yes. What would the impact be for this officer, reasonable 14 Q. 15 officer, of knowing that more officers were coming, all units were coming? 16 It means then you're buying time because you know 17 Α. 18 there's extra officers arriving so then once you've got sufficient there and you're notifying them which way 19 20 they're going, as those officers are joining you've got 21 more officers then to put a containment on to stop the 22 person having the freedom of movement and then you can 23 bring the containment in more and again, depending on time, how far behind is the dog because ideally you want 24 the dog involved so officers don't have to go into the 25

1 near space, but if no dog is available and isn't attending then at some point the officers are going to 2 3 have to go in closer to conduct the stop search, but at 4 least then if you've got multiple officers there you can 5 look at the use of force in order to facilitate the 6 search. 7 Q. So if circumstances permit, even at that stage, it would 8 be open to a reasonable officer to fall back, wait for 9 other officers, wait for a dog if available, and prepare 10 a tactical plan in amongst those other officers? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. Even at that stage? 13 Α. Yes. And would at that stage a reasonable officer be 14 Q. 15 considering ABD? We have heard about acute behavioural disorder or disturbance, we have heard about a phrase 16 17 used at an earlier stage called excited delirium. Is that the sort of thing that a reasonable officer would 18 19 be considering at that stage? They would definitely be considering mental health 20 Α. 21 crisis. That then links on to the next checklist in 22 relation to the ABD and thinking about what else do I -what else would I need to be triggering this, so it's 23 hanging there at the moment as a potential checklist, so 24 then you're thinking about, well, that's like excessive 25

1 body heat is a potential risk, lack of (inaudible). We haven't done anything yet to justify whether those other 2 bits are ticked, so yes, it might be there because it's 3 4 trained -- they're often trained hand in hand with the 5 intoxication and the mental health crisis risks. Here it's about ABD and positional asphyxia, so they're 6 7 trained as interweaving issues but then they could be also stand-alone. 8

9 Q. Right. If a reasonable officer was seeking to adopt 10 a minimum level of force, what options would be open to 11 that officer at this time?

A. This would be looking for trying to get a containment
on -- but you would need the additional officers. That
would then be a minimal level of force to contain.
Q. And if a reasonable officer was endeavouring to observe

16 the principle of preclusion, what would that reasonable 17 officer try first?

18 Well, in order to do -- it would be the verbals and the Α. distance because in order to do any sort of "Hey" --19 20 because sometimes if the person is in crisis they're not 21 aware that the person is there, unless you physically touch them to go "hey", but then you don't want an 22 officer to be going into that close space to be able to 23 touch a person until you know whether there is a knife 24 or not there, or whether there's sufficient officers be 25

to involved, so certainly at this point I would be
thinking the reasonable officer would be still thinking
about keeping their distance until there's sufficient
officers to try and be safer in the approach because if
no dog is coming, then at some point they're going to
have to go into that personal space in order to rule out
the concept of the knife.

Q. We have heard from Martin Graves in relation to this
scenario and I want to see if you agree with his views.
He says:

11 "At this point I would be looking at the information 12 in relation to what they knew before they arrived, 13 specifically if they believed the individual is in 14 possession of a knife, but it's a cold morning, the 15 person's wearing a T-shirt ..."

I'm reading this short:

16

17 "It's raining, their demeanour, their look indicates to the officer there's possibly intoxication of some 18 19 description, thinking around how might this person 20 respond to me. I might get out of the vehicle and 21 approach, they might not like the police, they don't 22 want to talk to us, they don't want to do anything, try to talk to them, see what's wrong with them. They're 23 obviously, you know, intoxicated or possibly 24 25 intoxicated, I need to establish that, and sometimes

25

1		that's only available to be able to talk to the
2		individual just to verify the fact."
3		Do you agree with what
4	Α.	I do agree with that, yes.
5	Q.	Martin Graves says about that. And he has described
6		it as:
7		"You've got level 1 profiled offender behaviour
8		here."
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	"And then they're approaching the vehicle, they're
11		getting out of the vehicle, they can assess the vehicle,
12		and then you would go to level 2, you would engage that
13		individual, try to engage that individual in
14		conversation, it could be something as simple as 'Stand
15		still', 'what's up?', 'What are you doing?', 'hello',
16		anything like that and see what sort of response I get.
17		Do I get a no response, some physical or verbal response
18		from that attempted communication, so you've got 1 and 2
19		very quickly together. Do you agree with that?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	Thank you.
22		I would like to move on to a different scenario
23		where officers have embarked on using strong verbal
24		commands and those commands are not complied with by the

subject. So the subject is walking towards the officers

1 when they get out of the vehicle, they park in his path, 2 he is not aiming for them as such, he continues walking and he doesn't move or divert away from them. 3 4 Again, thinking about the categories of profiled 5 offender behaviour, where would you place the behaviour that I have described? 6 7 Well, it's definitely level 2, as in the resistance Α. 8 there, but again, a key thing would be do they actually 9 understand what is expected of them to be doing because 10 a lot of the time, especially if someone is in crisis, 11 they might not even be aware that the police are there, 12 or that they are police, or if they're aware someone is 13 there, what they're even saying or wanting of them, so 14 I think there there would be an issue of how can we 15 demonstrate that they actually understand that we want 16 them to stop and engage. Is the -- for a reasonable officer, we see these 17 Q. 18 categories, you have said they would be aware of those, 19 would they also be considering the mindset of the 20 person, or the reason behind the behaviour? 21 Α. Yes. 22 And that would be part of the information they feed into Q. 23 the risk assessment? 24 Α. Yes. And so for the description I have given you of the 25 Q.

1		subject's behaviour, how would a reasonable officer
2		categorise that?
3	A.	Certainly level 2.
4	Q.	And the question would be asked do they understand, is
5		that what you said?
6	A.	Or they're looking for some feedback to them about does
7		this person actually understand we're the police and
8		we're wanting them to engage.
9	Q.	What if they don't get that feedback?
10	Α.	Well, then it might not be so much that it's because
11		we talked about profiled offender behaviour, but if the
12		person the person might not be an offender for
13		offender behaviour, it might be that they're actually in
14		a medical emergency, so they can't physically respond.
15	Q.	And what would a reasonable officer consider
16		an appropriate response to level 2 behaviour? Do you
17		want to go we can go down to 4.7 and see the
18		reasonable officer response?
19	A.	I think here we're looking most are at the verbal
20		interaction to try and get the person to look at them,
21		acknowledge them and show that they're either able to
22		acknowledge their presence
23	Q.	Right, if we look at level 2 "Tactical
24		communications"
25	A.	Yes.

1	Q.	are you your response you have just given us
2	A.	Tactical communications, yes.
3	Q.	We have heard that these different levels are not in
4		neat, clearly defined boxes, and there can be a range of
5		options within each level?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	Describe to us the range of options that are open to
8		a reasonable officer in level 2 tactical communications?
9	Α.	So at one extreme you've got the nurturing
10		communication, as in "I'm a police officer, I want to
11		help you, do you need help", and at the other end you've
12		got the scenario of the didactic, "Stop, down on your
13		knees", so it's a lot more didactic communication there,
14		but ultimately if you're trying to communicate with
15		someone you have to be able to send a message that that
16		person can receive so the methodology of the sending is
17		important as well because things that will affect that
18		message being received will include things like
19		intoxication and crisis.
20	Q.	And is it a matter for the discretion of the reasonable

21 officer to tailor their style of communication with the 22 needs of the subject -- the needs of the circumstances 23 that present themselves?

A. Yes, because the example I gave earlier about the
80-year-old lady who has gone missing from the care

1 home, the rest of the circumstances could be the same, 2 she is walking down the road in a nightdress, reports of 3 her having had a knife, lashing out at cars, that person 4 then might need a different tactic or officers might 5 give a different approach to that person than a young male who looks physically strong and healthy, but the 6 7 exact same circumstantial conditions other than their 8 demographics are different. And why would the response from the officer be different 9 Q. 10 if the circumstances were the same? Partly because of the threat that they would fear as 11 Α. 12 well if it goes wrong because they might then be 13 thinking, "I can deal with a frail 80-year-old person 14 who has gone missing from the care home", but then they 15 might think "I can't actually deal one-on-one with a young, fit, strong person", so those demographics will 16 have differences as well. 17 18 Q. We have heard evidence that in using the National 19 Decision-Making Model and in providing information into 20 that to carry out the risk assessment, that there are 21 many factors that can be fed into that --22 Α. Yes. 23 Q. -- but one of them can be your own skills, your own experience, your own capability, compared to the 24 25 subject?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	The training you have had, the equipment you have
3		available, or the equipment you don't have available?
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	The specialist resources that you have available or you
6		don't have available?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	Is that all correct?
9	Α.	Yes, definitely.
10	Q.	When we consider this scenario that we're looking at, to
11		what extent would a reasonable officer consider using
12		their CS or PAVA spray?
13	Α.	Well, CS and PAVA is a defensive tactic at level 4,
14		which then would be in response to self-defence, so
15		either defence of themselves, or defence of another
16		person.
17	Q.	So let's look at level 4. We were on we were looking
18		at level 2, tactical communications.
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	Level 3 is control skills and we will look at that in
21		a moment. Defensive tactics are:
22		" perceived to be strikes, whether delivered by
23		means of empty hand techniques or baton strikes, but
24		also include the more robust defensive handcuffing
25		techniques and the use of CS Incapacitant Spray."

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	So the use of that spray is a level 4
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	response?
5	A.	Yes.
6	Q.	And can you explain what would the view of a reasonable
7		officer be in using a level 4 defensive tactic by using
8		their spray in those circumstances?
9	A.	Yes, I think you would be looking at
10	Q.	Sorry, could I have one minute.
11		(Pause).
12		Are you happy to answer this question?
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	Sorry.
15	A.	You would be looking at use of spray if you felt there
16		was an imminent attack about to happen on you by that
17		person, or on your colleague by that person, and you're
18		using it then to defend your colleague or yourself or
19		a member of the public who is in imminent danger of
20		being attacked and preclusion-wise, you haven't got
21		a chance to, like, get in front of them and try and stop
22		them.
23	Q.	I was going to ask you in that if we go back up the
24		page we can see that sorry, yes. Level 3, "Control
25		skills", what would that envisage?

1 Α. So this is where you might put yourself in front of 2 people to separate them and push people back, so 3 typically, for example, in a domestic violence situation 4 where you might turn up and the two parties are arguing, 5 then, you know, you might get involved there and verbally and with hand gestures to separate the two into 6 7 separate rooms, but again, you haven't physically took 8 hold of anyone or restrained them, but you've got them 9 separated now into different rooms, simply by using your 10 hands or at worst a touch or a tap to say "Come on, this way", you know "This way" (indicating). 11 12 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame, I see that the stenographer has 13 given up. We really ought to have had a break for the 14 stenographer earlier but I think that might be 15 a convenient point, would it, to stop? MS GRAHAME: I would be obliged if that was possible. 16 17 I don't have my junior here today and it would be 18 an opportunity for me to reflect on some questions. 19 LORD BRACADALE: All right, we will stop there and --20 Ms Mitchell? 21 MS MITCHELL: (Mic turned off). 22 LORD BRACADALE: Yes, well, Ms Caffrey can go, I take it? MS MITCHELL: Yes. 23 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Caffrey, you can leave now and if you 24 come back at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. 25

1	A. Okay, thank you, sir.
2	(The witness withdrew)
3	LORD BRACADALE: Yes, Ms Mitchell, do you want to come to
4	the table?
5	MS MITCHELL: Yes, I'm obliged to the Chair for allowing me
6	this opportunity.
7	The Chair will have heard during the course of the
8	hearing this afternoon there was some noise from the
9	back of the Inquiry room, which appeared to be coming
10	from a telephone. Now, that sounded not like
11	a telephone might go off like a ringing tone, or perhaps
12	a ping because they have forgotten to put off the tone
13	or something, but it sounded actually as if something
14	was being listened to or a noise sounded like the
15	Chair can make their own inquiries, but it sounded like
16	football.
17	Now, I wonder if the Chair can make a direction to
18	ensure that all parties, when they are in the Inquiry,
19	are using their mobile phones for reasons of
20	communication between perhaps other people in their
21	group and for no other reason. Clearly of all the
22	witnesses that come to court and all the work that is
23	being done sorry to the Tribunal it's highly
24	important that we have the opportunity to clearly focus
25	and concentrate on that and this sort of interruption is

1	clearly not what we, or indeed the family, wish for.
2	LORD BRACADALE: Well, I shall reflect on that submission,
3	Ms Mitchell. I have had representations in relation to
4	a number of aspects of the activities of legal
5	representatives, so I will reflect on that as one
6	element of that. Thank you.
7	(3.51 pm)
8	(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Thursday,
9	1 December 2022)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
2	INDEX
3	
4	MS JOANNE CAFFREY (affirmed)1
5	Questions from MS GRAHAME1
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	