Tuesday, 7 February 2023 1 2 (10.00 am)3 LORD BRACADALE: There are some technical problems, I'll 4 have to rise and see what's happening. 5 (Pause) LORD BRACADALE: I am sorry about that. There was a problem 6 7 with the AV system which is now resolved. Good morning, Mr Kapadia. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Good morning. 10 MR DEV KAPADIA (affirmed) 11 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson. Questions from MS THOMSON 12 MS THOMSON: Thank you. 13 14 Q. Good morning. 15 A. Good morning. Q. What is your full name, please? 16 17 My full name is Dev Kapadia. Α. How old are you, Mr Kapadia? 18 Q. A. I am 58. 19 20 And what is your occupation? Q. 21 Α. I am Procurator Fiscal Depute. Q. You were sent some questions by the Inquiry team. 22 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. What we call a Rule 8 request, and you responded to those questions in writing. 25

- 1 A. I did.
- Q. What we call a Rule 8 response, which is effectively
- 3 your statement to the Inquiry.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. To your left, Mr Kapadia, there is a blue folder and if
- 6 you open that up there should be a copy of your Rule 8
- 7 response within. It has got the Inquiry reference
- 8 number 218. And if we turn to the final page of that
- 9 document.
- 10 MS THOMSON: Sir, I'm sorry, but there appears to be
- 11 a difficulty with the live transcription. I am advised
- 12 that is has stopped.
- 13 It is working. Sorry for the interruption.
- 14 Q. Do you see a copy of your Rule 8 response within the
- folder, Mr Kapadia?
- 16 A. I do.
- Q. If we turn to the very last page, we see that it's -- if
- 18 we can scroll to the very bottom, please, it's dated
- 19 21 December of 2022.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And although your signature has been redacted on the
- 22 screen, I believe that the copy in the folder will have
- your signature on it.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. You have helpfully incorporated all of the questions

1 that you were asked into this document, so it's 2 a composite of both the questions you were asked and 3 your responses. If we look at the penultimate 4 paragraph, that's paragraph 45, it states: 5 "I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true to the best of my recollection." 6 7 Α. Yes. And you go on to confirm your understanding that the 8 Q. 9 statement may form part of the evidence before the 10 Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website. 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. Did you answer the questions you were asked truthfully? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Did you do your best to give as full and accurate Q. 15 responses as you could, within the confines of your recollection? 16 I did. 17 Α. 18 You can look at that at any time if you would find it Q. 19 helpful to do so. I'm going to take you to some of the 20 paragraphs. If there are other paragraphs you would find it helpful to go to, please let me know and we'll 21 22 bring them up on the screen. Let's begin with paragraph 1 of -- I'll simply call 23 this your statement, by way of shorthand. 24 25 Α. Okay.

1 Q. The question you were asked was your position in the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service on 3 May 2 3 2015, how long you had been in that position, your 4 duties and responsibilities. You have explained that: 5 "On 3 May 2015 [you] held the position of Senior Procurator Fiscal depute in COPFS based in the 6 7 Dunfermline office. At that time [you] had been in the role as a senior depute for ... 6 years [although you] 8 had been in the Service since January 2000"--9 10 Α. That's correct. -- "as a Procurator Fiscal Depute." 11 Q. 12 So as at May 2015 you had about 15 years' experience 13 in the service --14 That's correct. Α. 15 -- six as a Senior Depute. Q. 16 Α. Yes. If we can scroll down a little, please, you go on to 17 Q. 18 explain what your role involved: 19 "My role as a senior court depute was to make 20 decisions on reports received from the Police 21 ([otherwise known as] marking cases), other reporting 22 agencies and then decide on appropriate action, to prepare and [conduct] criminal prosecutions in court 23 both at summary and solemn level, to mentor and provide 24 advice and support to colleagues when required, to deal 25

1 with search warrant applications and other legal requests, and give advice and instruction to reporting 2 3 agency and other external organisations as appropriate." 4 You go on to explain that you were: 5 "...also an on-call depute as [you] had the relevant experience. [You] dealt with on-call requests 6 7 appropriately, giving advice and direction as necessary to the calling police officer, bearing in mind not to 8 9 interfere with operational matters in the jurisdiction of the Police service of Scotland." 10 That's correct. 11 Α. 12 Q. So your responsibilities were wide-ranging. 13 Α. Yes. Q. You've outlined some of the key responsibilities at that 14 15 time which included decision-making around whether to prosecute a case that was reported to you by the police 16 17 or another agency --18 Α. Yes. 19 -- preparing and presenting cases in court, and dealing Q. 20 with applications for search warrants. 21 Α. That's correct. I'd like to ask you some questions about your role as 22 Q. an on-call depute, specifically. Should we understand 23 that the on-call depute system allows access to the 24 fiscal outwith ordinary working hours? 25

- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. So that would be evenings, possibly overnight and also
- 3 weekends?
- 4 A. Yes. It starts at 5 o'clock on Friday afternoon,
- 5 carries over into the weekend, until quarter to 9 in the
- 6 morning, and then you resume your duties at quarter past
- 7 5 in the evening and so on until 9 o'clock on Friday
- 8 morning when the on-call period ends.
- 9 Q. So is the on-call period Friday to Friday?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. A week at a time?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- Q. And is this some sort of rota system within the fiscal
- 14 service?
- 15 A. It is, yes.
- Q. One of the questions you were asked was how often you
- 17 had been on call, and you say elsewhere in your
- 18 statement that you would be on call six or eight times
- 19 a year.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. That you had been on the rota since 2003 and so you
- 22 estimated that you had perhaps been on call about 60
- times in total.
- A. It's a rough estimation, but yes, based on how often
- you'd be on call during the year. Sometimes it's less,

- 1 sometimes it's more. Sometimes you have to step in at
- 2 the last moment, if somebody has to pull out,
- 3 for example.
- Q. Okay. You explain in your statement that you deal with
- 5 requests from police officers --
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. -- out of hours. How would a police officer who needed
- 8 to contact the on-call fiscal get in touch with you?
- 9 A. The system now is that the -- a police officer has to
- obtain the permission of an inspector before they're
- allowed to make that call, and the call comes in from
- force control. It depends on whether they've got your
- phone number or not, but, for example, if I'm on-call
- 14 for Central and Fife, the call comes in from east
- overview, they say they've got a police officer and then
- they patch the officer through and you then speak
- directly to the police officer. In Tayside, the police
- 18 officers contact you directly.
- 19 Q. What was the position in 2015?
- 20 A. The -- looking from my on-call sheet, there was a call
- 21 from force control, so they would have called me to say
- 22 "We've got a police officer on the line" and then
- 23 a couple of minutes later, got a call from the --
- Q. So that system was already in place --
- 25 A. Yes.

-- back in 2015. 1 Q. 2 What sorts of requests might you expect to get as 3 an on-call depute? The requests have changed, no longer deal with homicide 4 Α. 5 calls, that's now dealt with by specialist homicide deputes, but in general, it's usually about drugs, 6 7 serious assaults where police are looking for clothing, weapons, sexual offences, for example, electronic 8 9 equipment, phones, laptops, and that, I would say, 10 encompasses the majority of phone calls. And drugs, sorry. 11 12 Q. Sorry. Are these the sort of things that you might deal 13 with during office hours as well? 14 Yes. Α. 15 You said, you mentioned drugs, the police might want to Q. 16 seize drugs. Yes. 17 Α. 18 What sort of call might you get in relation to drugs? Q. 19 It's usually with large amount of drugs where police Α. 20 have got information that drugs might be on the move 21 from, say, a safe house or somebody's carrying drugs, 22 and it's in relation -- it's in relation to the large supply of drugs, if I can put it that way. 23 24 Another area is where there are dirty drugs, somebody has died as a result of ingesting drugs and the 25

6

7

8

- police might call you to say "We believe that this

 person died as a result of ingesting drugs, and there is

 a need to try and find the source of those drugs to try

 and take them off the street to prevent any further

 supply and anybody else being harmed by them".
 - Q. In either of these situations, what are the police asking you to do, what's the nature of the request that they're making of you?
- They would be requiring a search warrant under the 9 Α. 10 Misuse of Drugs Act, and they would be asking you to 11 make an application to the on-call sheriff, the -- my 12 job would then be to prepare the search warrant, draft 13 the search warrant, usually send it back to the police 14 officer to check that the details are correct, 15 particularly in relation to the premises, because it's 16 quite important to get the address on the search 17 warrant. There can be mistakes elsewhere which are not 18 that important, but it is very important to make sure 19 that the address to be searched it, in fact, correct. 20 Thereafter, to contact the on-call sheriff to explain 21 the situation and then the on-call sheriff would then 22 contact the police officer, because the drugs warrants are required to be sworn on oath by the police. And 23 then the sheriff will either grant or not grant the 24 search warrant, it comes back to you, you then give it 25

to the police to then execute.

1

2 Q. All right. So these calls you can receive during office 3 hours too, but when these sorts of things happen out of 4 hours, the police would contact the on-call fiscal --5 Α. Yes. -- for assistance with the request for a warrant. 6 Q. 7 If a sudden or unexpected death occurs out of hours, the sort of death that might be reported to the fiscal, 8 9 would that be brought to the attention of the on-call depute? 10 It would depend on what the cause of the death was. 11 Α. 12 When we were -- when I was certainly dealing with 13 deaths, you usually got -- and they were almost always 14 in relation to homicides, but I can't remember when that 15 stopped. But I virtually got no calls about deaths unless it 16 17 related to some adulterated drugs, if I can put it that 18 way. 19 Okay. You mentioned earlier there being a homicide Q. 20 team --21 Α. Yes. 22 -- that also provided an on-call service. Q. 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. Would they receive calls about sudden and unexpected 25 deaths?

1 Α. Yes. All right. So we may hear evidence that Mr Bayoh's 2 Q. 3 death, which occurred on Sunday 3 May 2015 --4 Α. Yes. Q. -- was notified to the on-call fiscal, but that wasn't 5 6 yourself, it was someone else? 7 A. It wasn't me. Q. All right, and is a possible explanation for that, that 8 9 there was a different fiscal --10 Α. Yes. -- on-call for homicides and other reportable deaths? 11 Q. 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. Before we move on from this particular response to 14 a question asked of you, you say at the bottom part of 15 what we can see on the screen that: "[You] dealt with on-call requests appropriately, 16 17 giving advice and direction as necessary to the calling police officer, bearing in mind not to interfere with 18 19 operational matters within the jurisdiction of the 20 Police service of Scotland." 21 Α. Yes. 22 Can you help us to understand what you mean by Q. 23 "operational matters" and why you shouldn't interfere 24 with them?

I don't have any direct control over the police,

25

1 I cannot tell a police officer what to do and what not 2 to do. If the police are in the course of 3 an investigation, they have their own procedures to 4 follow, and I would have very little influence over how 5 they go about conducting their investigation. I can provide helpful hints, but the police are under no 6 7 obligation to take my advice, and they would have their own procedures to follow. So that is just what I would 8 9 call operational matters. 10 Q. So it's respecting the parameters of your role --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- and also understanding the parameters of their role? 13 Absolutely. We have separate functions, and part of my Α. 14 function is to have an overview of what the police can 15 or cannot do, and that is in relation to search warrants where, if I feel that there is insufficient information 16 17 given to me, then I would not -- I would say to the 18 police that I wasn't -- I'm not approving this 19 particular warrant, I'm not going to take it to 20 a sheriff. 21 Q. And what would happen thereafter would be an operational 22 matter for --A. How they then conduct the search, what methods they use 23 is entirely up to the police, and I would have no 24 influence over that. 25

- 1 Q. All right. Well, perhaps we'll return to that later,
- 2 but for present purposes that would be an example of you
- 3 not looking to trespass on the function of the police.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Can we go to paragraph 22, please. You've already told
- 6 us a little about the process that you follow when you
- 7 receive an application for a warrant, in particular
- 8 a drugs warrant.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. There is some further information in this paragraph, so
- I'd like to go through it with you and ask you a few
- 12 questions.
- 13 You begin by explaining that:
- 14 "Generally speaking the police will crave a warrant
- to secure evidence where the occupants of the property
- 16 will not freely allow police access. The purpose of the
- search warrant might be to seize drugs, electronic
- 18 equipment, stolen property, clothing, firearms or other
- 19 weapons."
- You mention there a situation where the occupants of
- 21 the property will not freely allow the police access.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Should we understand, then, that in a situation where
- the occupants are quite happy for the police to come in
- 25 to carry out a search, there wouldn't be a need for the

1 police to seek a warrant?

A. Generally speaking, it depends on who the occupants are, what control they have over the property and whether they are freely allowing the police to enter the property.

On occasion where I've got a call from the police to say that the occupants have said that we can go in and look for whatever it is they're looking for, I would explain to the police officer that as long as the occupants were aware that they had the right to refuse, so they were making a free choice, then there would be no need for a warrant. But in the majority of instances, it's always safer to go in with a warrant than not.

Q. You go on:

"The procurator fiscal's role is to assess the intelligence, its quality and the necessity to use force to secure whatever evidence the police reasonably believe is likely to be in the property. Once it passes that threshold, the procurator fiscal will draft the search warrant and submit it to the sheriff with the relevant details and it will then be a matter for the sheriff whether or not there is sufficient information or intelligence to grant a warrant. For search warrants which require to be sworn on oath or

- 1 affirmed (mainly firearms and drugs), the deponing officer will have to address the sheriff directly about 2 3 the veracity of the intelligence." 4 You explain there, Mr Kapadia, that it would be your 5 role to assess the intelligence and the quality of that 6 intelligence. 7 Α. Yes. Can you help us to understand how you go about that 8 Q. 9 task? 10 Α. The police, when they receive intelligence, it's graded according to where the information has come from and how 11 12 reliable that information is, and they have a grading 13 system which I'm sure the police can explain it better 14 than I can. If it's just gossip, then that would be the 15 lowest quality of intelligence. They would still record it, but there would not be intelligence that I would 16
- 20 Q. So you carry out an assessment of the quality of the intelligence, looking at both the information itself and the source --

approving a warrant to go to a sheriff.

find satisfactory enough to proceed with grant -- with

22 A. Yes.

17

18

Q. -- of the intelligence, and you explain in your written
answer that you also consider the necessity to use
force --

1 Α. Yes. Q. -- to secure the evidence that the police believe will 2 3 be in the property. For the benefit of members of the 4 public who are following your evidence, do we take it 5 from that, that if a warrant is granted it will authorise the police to use force? 6 7 Yes, it does. Α. And that would be to use force to enter the property? 8 Q. 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. And any locked cupboards or safes within the property? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. And to seize anything of evidential value that was 13 found --14 Yes. Α. 15 Q. -- within the terms of the --16 A. That's correct. 17 Q. -- warrant? 18 Sorry, could we scroll up a little bit, please. 19 Thank you. Perfect. The bottom paragraph on the 20 screen, you explain about assessing the intelligence, 21 its quality and the necessity to use force. You go on 22 to say: "Once it passes that threshold, the ... fiscal will 23 draft the search warrant ..." 24 So should we understand, then, that you will assess 25

- the intelligence according to the grading system that

 you have described and also you will take into account

 that if the warrant is ultimately granted --
- 4 A. Yes.
- Q. -- it is giving the police the power to use force to enter someone's home, potentially, and to seize evidence~--
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. -- and that's a consideration that you weigh in the
 10 balance when deciding whether or not to present
 11 a warrant to a sheriff?
- 12 Α. If there's enough evidence or enough intelligence for 13 the police to reasonably suspect that there might be 14 firearms or drugs within a property, then that would be 15 enough for the warrant to be granted. How much force the police then use to enter that property will be --16 17 depend upon the circumstances. For example, somebody at the property might say "Well, you don't have to use 18 19 a battering ram to come in, if you've got a warrant, 20 you know, I'll open the door for you". Others might 21 barricade themselves in, drug dealers, or houses where 22 drugs are stored, generally have some sort of barricades behind them, and it will require quite an amount of 23 force for the police to enter, which might give the 24 25 occupants a little bit more time to dispose of the

1 drugs, if they're so inclined to do so. 2 You said in your response to the question I asked "If Q. 3 the police have reasonable ground to suspect...", is 4 that the test, is that the threshold you refer to in 5 your written response? 6 Yes. Α. 7 Q. So you're assessing intelligence --8 Α. Yes. -- according to the grading system with a view to 9 Q. 10 reaching your own independent view --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- independent of the police as to whether the 13 intelligence is such that the officers have a reasonable 14 ground to suspect --15 Α. Yes. 16 -- that there is evidence within a particular property. Q. Over the years I find that the police's self-assessment 17 Α. of their intelligence is perhaps higher than 18 19 an independent person might ... might think. 20 So, can the police be optimistic, shall we say --Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 -- in their applications? But at the end of the day, Q. what I understand from your evidence is that you, in 23 applying this test, you have a gatekeeping function? 24 That is pretty much in a nutshell, yes. 25 Α.

- 1 Q. So the police cannot approach a sheriff directly, they
- 2 have to go via you as the gatekeeper.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. They will have made their own assessment as to whether
- 5 the intelligence they have forms a reasonable ground --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- to suspect that there is relevant evidence at that
- 8 particular property, but you will carry out that
- 9 assessment yourself --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- objectively, and if you agree with the police then
- 12 you will proceed to prepare the warrant and place it
- before the sheriff.
- 14 A. That is correct.
- Q. And if not, then you won't.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. If we could scroll down a little, please. Just at the
- 18 top of the page there you say that:
- 19 "For search warrants which require to be sworn on
- 20 oath or affirmed..."
- 21 That would include a drugs warrant?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. "...the deponing officer will have to address the
- 24 sheriff directly about the veracity of the
- 25 intelligence."

- 1 I wanted to ask you a little bit about that. Am I right to understand that a warrant for drugs would be 2 3 a warrant made under the Misuse of Drugs Act? 4 Α. That's correct. 5 And, as you allude to here in your written answer, in Q. 6 that situation, as well as making an approach to you as 7 the fiscal and on the assumption that you have authorised the placing of a warrant application before 8 the sheriff --9 10 Α. Yes. -- the police would still require to persuade 11 Q. 12 the sheriff --13 Α. Yes. -- themselves as to the quality of the information. 14 Q. The information that the police provide me in a written Α.
- 15 A. The information that the police provide me in a written
 16 application would contain the intelligence that the
 17 police would have to present to the sheriff and swear on

oath that is true, as far as they're concerned.

- 19 Q. And you refer to that being necessary for warrants for
- 20 drugs or for firearms.
- 21 A. Yes.

18

- Q. If the police were seeking a warrant for, let's say, stolen property, or a murder weapon --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- would the police require to swear an oath or be

1 affirmed in the same way or would you --2 Α. No. -- simply convey that the information to the sheriff? 3 Q. 4 Α. No. Those are Common Law Warrant which are made by the 5 Procurator Fiscal directly to the sheriff and the discussions regarding the information, intelligence 6 7 about the subject matter, is between the sheriff and the Procurator Fiscal, not the police. Occasionally the --8 if the sheriff wants to ask the police a question 9 10 directly, they may do so, but the warrant is from the Procurator Fiscal to the sheriff, it's a Common Law 11 12 Warrant, and it does not require to be deponed or 13 affirmed by a police officer. Q. Returning then to the situation with a drugs warrant 14 15 where a police officer does require to address the sheriff directly, you've explained that the 16 17 information that would be laid before the sheriff is the 18 same as the information that the police would have made 19 available to you --20 A. Yes. 21 -- and earlier in your evidence you said that you would Q. 22 draft the warrant --23 A. Yes. Q. -- there would be a little bit of backwards and forwards 24 25 making sure that the address was correct --

1	Α.	Yes.
_	4 A •	T C D •

- Q. -- and so on. What part does the sheriff then play when receiving the warrant application and hearing from the officers as to the quality of the intelligence they have and their request for the warrant?
 - A. That process has now changed. The previous process was that during office hours you would accompany the police officer into chambers where the sheriff would put the officer on oath and the officer would then essentially give the same information given to the Procurator Fiscal.

Since the creation of the electronic warrants, that is now all done remotely. The application would come into the Procurator Fiscal, I would then send that to --during office hours, to the sheriff clerk who then passes it to the sheriff, the sheriff then contacts the police officer directly, and then the next thing you would know that either the warrant's been granted and has come through, or it's been refused. So you don't have any further part to play in that.

Prior to the electronic warrants, you drafted the warrants at home, it was then printed out at home on the office printer, which you got as part of the on-call kit, the police came to your house to collect the warrant and then went to the sheriff's house to present

- the warrant and be put on oath, and then they would have the signed warrant.
- Q. What was the situation in 2015, how were things done then?
- A. It was, I think, physical and hard copy warrants, where
 you would then prepare the warrant, print it out, sign
 it, police would come and pick up the hard copy, and
 then take it to the on-call sheriff.
- 9 Q. In either situation, what test would the sheriff apply in deciding whether to grant or refuse the warrant?
- 11 A. Essentially, it's a matter for the sheriff as to whether
 12 the sheriff accepted that there was sufficient
 13 intelligence or sufficient evidence there to reasonably
 14 suspect that there was drugs or a weapon or whatever it
 15 was that you were looking for, within that property.
- Q. So it's essentially the same test as the one that you would apply --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- when exercising your gatekeeping function?
- 20 A. Yeah.
- Q. Before we move on, at the very bottom of the blue text on the screen, you say:
- 23 "If the drugs are suspected to be in a private 24 property, unless there is an element of urgency, the 25 police will require a search warrant to enter the

1

premises and carry out a search."

2 Α. Yes. We have already spoken about the possibility of 3 Q. 4 a householder consenting to a search. 5 Α. Yes. We've discussed warrants and you've introduced here the 6 Q. 7 concept of urgency --8 Α. Yes. 9 -- and the possibility of search without warrant --Q. 10 Α. Yes. -- if the situation is urgent. Can you tell us 11 Q. 12 a little more about that? 13 It depends upon the circumstances. If the police Α. 14 believe that there is a risk of evidence being destroyed 15 or drugs being flushed down the toilet, then they ... then they can -- it would have to be justified at 16 17 a later stage, they can enter the property to prevent the destruction of any evidence or the disposal of 18 19 drugs. But they would have to be extreme circumstances. 20 The ... the only way I could give you 21 an explanation, if the police have intelligence, say 22 a car is on its way to deliver drugs, somehow the driver of the car suspects that they're being followed, they 23 stop, go straight into a house which is not known to the 24 25 police and the police believe that the drugs are about

- 1 to be destroyed, then I think they would be justified
- 2 for them to go into that house and try and recover what
- 3 they can.
- Q. In a situation where the police don't have a search
- 5 warrant, or other lawful ground to carry out a search,
- such as the householder's consent, or urgency of the
- 7 type that you have described, what would be the
- 8 consequences if they were to search a property
- 9 regardless and seize evidence?
- 10 A. The likelihood is that the search and recovery of the
- evidence would be deemed inadmissible and -- in later
- 12 court proceedings.
- Q. I would like to ask you a few questions about
- 14 record-keeping when you're on call. Do you keep records
- of the calls that you receive on call, any advice you
- 16 give, any decision that you might make?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. How are they recorded?
- 19 A. They are, these days it's recorded on a laptop, in the
- 20 past it used to be recorded on pieces of paper or
- a notebook.
- Q. And what was the position in 2015?
- 23 A. They would be recorded in a notebook.
- Q. Can I take you please to paragraph 8 of the statement,
- and the second paragraph in blue text. You say:

"Insofar as on-call warrants are concerned, if 1 a written application is received from the police, this 2 3 and any search warrant applied for is retained in 4 electronic or paper form (the latter much less so now, 5 in the age of electronic warrants) in line with the [Crown Office] data retention policy." 6 7 Α. Yes. And if we can scroll down, please, if we can stop there, 8 Q. 9 please, and look at the final substantive paragraph, you 10 say: "In cases where the application is refused during 11 12 the initial telephone call, for example in a case such 13 as this, there is no copy of an application (unless the 14 police have pre-prepared one -- and retained it 15 themselves) or a warrant as there is no need to prepare one." 16 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. "The only record I would have had was the hand written 19 note I took during the telephone call, which I would 20 have taken to the office and put in a folder holding my 21 on-call notes and subsequently destroyed securely. 22 I also have secondary notes from when I prepared my on-call claim form at the end of the on-call week and 23 submitted electronically and retained in an electronic 24 folder on my COPFS laptop." 25

1 A. Yeah.

- Q. Can you explain how information makes its way into your
 on-call claim form.
 - A. The -- whatever calls I receive during the week or certainly in 2015 would have been, would have been in a notebook. The -- if the matter proceeds to a warrant application being, say, approved by me, and they're on to the sheriff, police are required to submit a written application, so that will come in, in a typewritten form, on a standard police search warrant application form, which you would then keep and you would then also have a copy of the warrant. So you would have a full record of the -- not only the conversation, but the information which was given to you by the police at the time.

If the warrant is refused or the application is refused by me, there is no written application submitted by the police, either because they haven't already done so, or because they know even putting that forward would be essentially futile, because the application has been, has been refused.

So no, I would not then have a copy of whatever information that the police were planning on submitting in the event of, of my saying "Yes, there is enough information there for me to apply for a warrant to

the sheriff." 1 So in that situation, you would have your handwritten 2 Q. 3 notes --4 Α. Yes. 5 -- that you took at the time of the call. Q. 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. And back in 2015 they would have been handwritten notes --8 9 Yes. Α. 10 Q. -- rather than computerised --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- records. 13 And then I would have taken them to the office and put Α. 14 them in the on-call folder and then at the end of the 15 week submit my on-call claim form. When you submit the on-call claim form, is that in 16 Q. 17 respect of the additional time that you've worked out of 18 hours and you make a claim in respect --19 Yes. Α. 20 -- of that time, a financial claim? And should we Q. 21 understand, then, that when you make that claim, you have to explain that you spent five minutes doing this 22 or half an hour doing that --23 24 Α. Yes.

Q. -- to justify the financial claim that you're making?

25

- 1 So there would be a record, you would call that
- 2 a secondary note saved within your actual claim form?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. And I believe you explain in your statement that the
- 5 handwritten notes that you would have prepared back in
- 6 2015 will have been long since destroyed --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- and so the only record that is now available, in
- 9 relation to on-call work that you did in 2015, will be
- 10 your claim form.
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 Q. Mr Kapadia, I'd like to move on to ask you some
- questions about a call that you received on 4 May of
- 14 2015, when you were the on-call depute. I know that you
- say in your statement that you don't recall which
- officer it was --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- who phoned you, but we'll hear evidence from
- 19 a DC Robert Finch that he phoned you and I don't think
- that you would dispute that.
- 21 A. No, I can't dispute that, if -- I recognise the name
- 22 from my time working in Fife, and he was a detective
- constable in Fife Constabulary.
- Q. If we can turn to paragraph 9, please, at the bottom of
- 25 the screen, you explain the only notes that you have in

1 relation to this call come from the on-call claim 2 form~--3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. -- as we've discussed, and you say: "This was a call from the police on 4 May 2015 at 5 16:46 hours lasting [approximately] 5 minutes which 6 7 notes 'TC ..." Would that be telephone call? 8 Telephone call, yes. 9 Α. 10 Q. "'Drugs search warrant -- search of property "connected" to death of Sheku Bayoh'". 11 12 Α. Yes. Is that the only record that you now retain in relation 13 Q. 14 to the telephone call that you received on 4 May 2015? 15 Α. It is. Do you actually remember this call, or do you require to 16 Q. rely on the note within your submission form? 17 I don't -- I don't recall that, the telephone call, no. 18 Α. 19 Can you assist us whether you had had any earlier calls Q. 20 in relation to the death of Mr Bayoh? He had passed 21 away the previous day. 22 I had not received any calls the previous day, no. Α. The -- I think the only two calls which are listed, one 23 was from force control, which would have been the 24 introductory call, and a few minutes after that, the 25

- 1 call from the police officer. So was this your first involvement in any way in the 2 Q. 3 police investigation following the death of Mr Bayoh? 4 Α. Yes. And was it, indeed, your only involvement? 5 Q. 6 As far as, as far as I recall, yes. Α. 7 Q. You say: "This was my only involvement in the matter, where 8 9 it would appear that I was called by the police with 10 a request to apply to the sheriff with a search warrant under the misuse of drugs act 1971 for a property which 11 12 was connected [to] the death of Sheku Bayoh. "From recollection it was for a minute amount of 13 14 cannabis and a grinder, and it seemed to me at the time 15 that the link to the death was somewhat tenuous in that the information I had was that the property to be 16 17 searched was 'connected' [in inverted commas] to the 18 death. I did not have any details about the death or how it had come about or any indication that the death 19 20 had resulted from the drugs from that property." 21 Can we scroll down a little, please? Okay. Before 22 I ask you any questions, can we look briefly at what you say in paragraph 18 of your statement. 23
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. You say:

1		"[Your] understanding was that the police had
2		advised [you], briefly, of the death of an individual
3		and wanted a warrant for a property for a small amount
4		of cannabis and (possibly a grinder) and the property
5		appeared to be connected to the death. I refused the
6		police application because (from recollection) it
7		did not appear that the death resulted from the drugs or
8		that there was any previous intelligence of drug dealing
9		at the property. It did not appear to me that a search
10		warrant was proportionate under those circumstances."
11		I want to ask you a few questions to help us all to
12		understand why you refused
13	Α.	Okay.
14	Q.	the application.
15		Firstly, can we be clear about what the application
16		related to. You refer to cannabis, a minute or small
17		amount of cannabis. Do you know what quantity of
18		cannabis?
19	Α.	No. But it would not have been it would not have
20		been significant. For example, saying that there are
21		dealer quantities of drugs in that property. Because
22		otherwise I would have then asked further questions
23		about what intelligence that the police had in relation
24		to drug dealing from that property.
25	Q.	So this small or minute amount, should we understand

- 1 that it would be what might be thought of as a personal
- 2 amount, not a --
- 3 A. Yes. Not a dealer level.
- Q. Not a dealer level, all right, and if we were to hear
- 5 evidence that the police assessed it to be half a gram
- 6 or a gram, would that fit with your understanding of --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- what a small amount is?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. There's reference there to a grinder.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. What's a grinder?
- 13 A. It's, I think what people use to grind cannabis, to
- 14 consume it. I've only ever seen them in productions in
- plastic bags, so that is what I would assume, that
- they -- is meant by "grinder".
- 17 Q. Okay. I'm maybe asking the wrong person that kind of
- 18 question.
- 19 A. Yes, you're certainly asking the wrong person.
- Q. So let's move onto safer ground. Can you help us to
- 21 understand why you've thought the link between the
- 22 property and the death was tenuous?
- 23 A. The -- from my recollection and practice, if the -- they
- 24 were saying that Mr Bayoh had obtained or -- obtained
- drugs or consumed drugs in that property, but it had no

1 bearing on the death, so that is what I meant by a "tenuous connection" between the property to be 2 3 searched and the death. The example I gave you earlier 4 on that if somebody had obtained drugs from a property 5 and as a result of which had died, then there would be 6 a direct connection between the property to be searched 7 so that the police would have grounds to go and recover any drugs for evidential purposes, and also for the 8 9 health and safety of the general public so that the 10 drugs were not further distributed to anybody else. Okay. You say that it didn't appear that the death had 11 Q. 12 resulted from the drugs. By that do you mean the 13 cannabis --Yes. 14 Α. -- found within this property? 15 Q. 16 There's mention in your statement to you not being 17 aware of any previous intelligence of drug dealing at 18 that property. How did you know that? Did that 19 information come from the police? Is that the sort of 20 enquiry they would make before calling you? 21 No, that's based on the fact that I refused the warrant. Α. 22 If the police say that there was a history of drug dealing from that property or a known drug dealer lived 23 at that property, that would all be intelligence that 24 25 the police would give you in support of the application

- 1 to get a search warrant to search that property to say 2 that numerous individuals attended that property at 3 various hours of the day to buy drugs, and that would 4 help build a bigger picture in terms of whether or not 5 the police had reasonable cause to suspect that there
- was drugs inside that property.
- 8 Α. Yes.

Q.

6

7

You said that it didn't appear that a search warrant was 9 Q. 10 proportionate in all the circumstances.

And that intelligence was absent in this case?

- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Q. Can you help us to understand what you mean by that, not 13 proportionate?
- I meant by simply the amount of drugs that the police 14 Α. 15 said that they were -- either had or were looking for. Because if the police requested a search warrant every 16 17 time they stopped a person who had half a gram, a gram 18 or a couple of grams of cannabis, then the system would 19 break down and it would not be proportionate in terms of 20 the eventual outcome as to whether or not the police 21 would be granted powers in terms of a search warrant to 22 force entry to a property, to go and find a small cigarette or crumbs of cannabis. 23
- Thank you. Can we look at paragraph 35, please, where 24 Q. 25 you explain a little more about your reasoning:

1 "The officer I spoke to was looking for a drugs search warrant for a property, as I have noted 2 3 'connected' to the death of the deceased, where I took 4 the view that the connection was tenuous. I was being 5 formally asked to apply for a search warrant, which was 6 normal except the amount of drugs to be recovered was 7 very small." If I can pause there, you said at the very beginning 8 9 of your evidence that ordinarily when the police apply 10 for a search warrant for drugs it's for more substantial 11 quantities --12 Α. Yes. 13 -- or it's for what you called "dirty drugs". Q. 14 Α. Yes. 15 How common is it, in your experience, whether any Q. officer on call, for an officer to make an application 16 17 for a warrant for a minute or a small quantity of 18 cannabis? 19 I would say it was quite rare. Α. 20 "I was being formally asked to apply for a search Q. warrant, which was normal except the amount of drugs to 21 22 be recovered was very small. Normal practice would be to ask what intelligence the police had about the 23 individuals and their connections to drugs or [to] the 24 onward supply of drugs. If, prima facie, there was 25

enough information available to me to apply for [the] search warrant, the police officer would be requested to submit a written application which would contain [the] full details of the property to be searched, the occupants of the property, what intelligence the police had about the individuals and ... the property e.g., the property was a 'known' safe house to store drugs, or that the occupier was a 'known' dealer and there were recent reports of individuals regularly attending to buy drugs."

And is that precisely the sort of intelligence information that was missing from the picture here?

A. Yes.

Q. You continue:

"If the written application and information reflected what I had been told over the phone and it was necessary to do so, then I would take steps to draft a warrant and submit it to the on-call sheriff at any time of the day or night. An example of the necessary urgency would be if the police had received a tip-off that drugs were about to be moved from a property, or a dealer had been arrested in possession of drugs and his [or] her associates might go to the house concerned and remove drugs or paraphernalia, for the dealer (or [indeed] for themselves!)"

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. So here are you giving an illustration, having explained
- 3 the reasons for refusing this particular warrant, you're
- 4 giving an example of the type of case where you would
- 5 not only be willing to put a warrant before the sheriff
- 6 --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- but you would be willing to do so in the middle of
- 9 the night.
- 10 A. Yes. I've occasionally got calls where a car has been
- 11 stopped on its way to deliver drugs and if the courier
- does not go to where he's supposed to be -- or he or she
- is supposed to be delivering the drugs, then suspicions
- might be raised, and if there are other drugs at the
- property where the courier has come from then the
- opportunity to search that property might be lost
- because the person might be in custody, somebody might
- get suspicious and go straight to the house to remove
- drugs, cash or any other paraphernalia that might be
- incriminatory.
- 21 Q. You explained earlier in your evidence that in
- 22 a situation possibly of that sort, urgency in and of
- 23 itself could potentially justify a search without
- 24 warrant, but it is always better to be safe than sorry
- 25 --

1 Α. Yes. 2 -- and if time permits --Q. 3 Α. Yes. 4 -- then a warrant should be sought. Q. 5 Α. Yes. Q. Can we go to paragraph 29, please. There are in fact 6 7 two paragraphs with 29, so if we could go up a little bit, please, there we are, you were provided, 8 Mr Kapadia, with an extract from DC Finch's statement --9 10 Α. Yes. Q. -- and asked to comment. So DC Finch in his Inquiry 11 12 statement says: 13 "I've written in my daybook ... 'Relating to 14 investigation? Putting pen through it. No wanting to 15 bother Sheriff 1700. Spoke to A/N -- PF. Operational matter From prosecution point of view -- nothing will be 16 17 done'. 18 "I have been referred to my notebook at pages 2 and 3: 'Monday 4 May 2015 ... 1700. Spoke to PF 19 20 DEV KAPADIA. Not authorised to approach JP/Sheriff for 21 warrant. Prosecution would do nothing. Operational matter...'" 22 If we scroll down a little further, you were invited 23 to comment on these entries and you say: 24 "I don't recall using these words, but accept that 25

1 was the tenor of my response, ie that the connection between the property was tenuous, as described to me, 2 3 and that any offence regarding the cannabis and the 4 grinder was de minimis and would not reach the threshold 5 of prosecution in court for any offences relating to the drugs themselves. The on-call facility is not designed 6 7 to be available for small amounts of drugs which, at best, would be marked for non-court disposals, such as 8 9 fiscal fines or warning letters. On that basis I would 10 not bother a sheriff for a de minimis matter." 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. I want to ask you a few questions around what is said in 13 DC Finch's Inquiry statement and his daybook and your 14 response --15 Α. Yes. -- just to help us all understand your decision-making 16 Q. 17 here. 18 You refer to the -- or any offence around the drugs 19 as being "de minimis". 20 Α. Yes. 21 Just for the benefit of any members of the public who Q. 22 might be listening to your evidence, what do you mean by an offence that's de minimis? 23 That technically it is an offence, but the quantities 24 Α. involved are so small that they would not be marked for 25

- 1 court prosecution.
- 2 Q. And is that what you mean when you say "Would not reach
- 3 the threshold for prosecution"?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. You say, too, that the on-call facility is not designed
- to be available for small amounts of drugs which would
- 7 at best be marked for non-court disposals.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Why is a call of this sort perhaps not what the on-call
- 10 facility is designed for?
- 11 A. Because from my understanding that it was a small amount
- of drugs and associated grinder which in itself is not
- unlawful to have, but the grinder itself might contain
- traces of cannabis, and so what was being presented to
- me was, yes, technically an offence, depending upon the
- 16 circumstances, it might be looked upon at the lower end
- of the scale in terms of how somebody marking a case
- 18 with the report of, say, a gram of cannabis might -- it
- 19 might result in a warning letter or a fiscal fine,
- something of that nature. It certainly would not reach
- 21 the threshold of being prosecuted, at the lower ends in
- 22 the Justice of the Peace Court, for example.
- 23 Q. So even at the lowest end of the criminal justice
- 24 system, this case was unlikely to ever make its way into
- 25 court?

1 Α. No. 2 Q. Okay. 3 You say: 4 "On that basis I would not bother a sheriff --5 Α. Yes. -- for a de minimis matter." 6 Q. 7 How would you have anticipated a sheriff would have reacted if they'd been bothered out of hours for 8 9 something like this? 10 Α. It would have depended upon which sheriff was on call 11 that week, but the responses would have ranged from 12 fairly ... expletive, depending on who the sheriff was, 13 to a polite "No". 14 Mr Kapadia, did you yourself feel bothered by the police Q. 15 calling you about a matter of this sort out of office hours? 16 17 Yes, to a certain extent, I would not have expected to Α. 18 be called for that. I've had other calls in respect of, 19 say, small amounts of stolen property, or a minor 20 assault, where the police think that they might want 21 a search warrant to go and get stuff, but it would 22 depend upon the circumstances, but yes, I've had very few calls where the drugs are minor and there's no other 23 24 evidence of dealing. That's not to say that somebody 25 who's been caught with a small amount of drugs is not

25

1 a drug dealer, even the presence of no drugs sometimes might invite a warrant, for example, if they're simply 2 3 carrying a large amount of cash or if they've got -- or 4 if they've been stopped and a phone has been found or 5 a "tick list" has been found, it might give you further information about larger amounts of drugs. 6 7 But in this case, no, it was just a small amount of 8 drugs and nothing else. What would you have expected the police might have done 9 Q. 10 here as an alternative to picking up the phone to you out of hours? 11 12 Α. Just seizing the -- seizing the drugs and perhaps 13 submitting a report, a standard prosecution report. If the police had seized the drugs, and we might go on 14 Q. 15 to hear that in fact they did seize the drugs, without a warrant, either because they haven't sought one or 16 17 because it has been refused or not put before a sheriff, 18 what would be the basis of their authority to seize the 19 drugs? Well, the actual seizing of the drugs would be that it 20 Α. 21 is unlawful to be in possession, and I would not expect 22 the police to be leaving behind any drugs that they find, regardless of the amount. If they've stopped 23 somebody, under the Misuse of Drugs Act and found, let's 24 say, half a gram or a crumb of cannabis, I wouldn't

1 expect them to be giving it back to that person and say, you know "On your way", I would be expecting them to --2 3 I would expect them to seize it, so that that person no 4 longer had possession of something they were not 5 entitled to be in possession of. Can we look at paragraph 30, please. You were asked 6 Q. 7 whether you recalled saying words to the effect of "putting a pen through it". 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. We saw that in DC Finch's Inquiry statement, when we looked at paragraph 29, and you said -- and you were 11 12 also asked what does that mean and why was it the case 13 in this matter, and you said in your written response: 14 "It meant that if the police reported someone for 15 being in possession of a small amount of cannabis, depending on the amount, the accused's previous 16 17 convictions, and circumstances, there would likely be no further action. Although I no longer have any notes, 18 I would have said that if it appeared to me from the 19 20 information provided that the quantity of drugs was so 21 small that it would not merit prosecution and any 22 further action would be disproportionate." When you spoke with DC Finch do you recall whether 23 you explained your reasoning to him? Or, I appreciate 24 your memory of the events of 2015 is perhaps poor, would 25

1 it be your practice to explain your reasoning? Oh, I would certainly explain my practice -- or explain 2 Α. 3 my reasoning as to why I'm saying that, you know, I 4 perhaps would have not quite used legalese terms, but 5 I would have told them it was rubbish and the matter would not be taken -- taken any further. 6 7 If we can look at paragraph 33, again in both the Q. DC Finch's Inquiry statement and in his notebook he has 8 9 used the words "operational matter" in a context that 10 suggests that that's something that you might have said to him, and you were asked whether you recalled saying 11 12 that the matter was an operational one and what did that 13 mean. You said: 14 "Again I don't specifically recall saying this but 15 it is something I would say because I don't have the power or authority to prevent or advise the police what 16 17 to do in terms of reporting an offence through a ... 18 (Standard Prosecution Report) but I can tell them what 19 the likely outcome would be in terms of marking a case, 20 and therefore reporting a de minimis matter such as 21 a few crumbs of cannabis or the tail end of a 'joint' 22 would be a decision for the police and 'an operational matter'." 23 Can I ask you, Mr Kapadia, at any point is it up to 24

the police to decide whether someone is prosecuted or

25

1 not?

A. No, it's not up to the police to decide, because the prosecution -- prosecution decision rests upon the Procurator Fiscal, once the police report has been received, and that effectively starts the ball rolling in terms of criminal procedure from a crime being detected. It doesn't mean that every crime that's detected is always reported to the police, the police sometimes have discretion as to whether they take matters forward or not.

So, in the example I've given, that if you've got a 16 or a 17-year-old being searched under the Misuse of Drugs Act and a tiny crumb of cannabis had been found in the pocket, it would be a matter -- an operational matter for the police as to how they deal with the matter, whether they arrest that person, whether they report that crime, or whether they simply deal with it by way of a police warning or whatever other means that they have at their disposal to deal with it -- such matters. I can't stop the police from reporting the matter, if they were insistent on doing so, the paths that they have, and I then have to take a decision in terms of whether or not a prosecution, or any other form of fiscal action, is merited.

Q. So the decision-making isn't for the police, it's for

- 1 the fiscal, and the most the police can do is submit
- 2 a report to the fiscal?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. But they cannot influence the decision that the fiscal
- 5 will make?
- A. No, they cannot do that. On the other hand, I could
- give them subtle hints that, you know, there's no point
- 8 in wasting their time and resources in going through --
- 9 going through, drafting up an SPR and submitting it,
- 10 because the eventual outcome would be just as I was
- telling you, it would be a waste of everybody's time.
- 12 Q. And was your statement to DC Finch that this was rubbish
- an example of that sort of hint?
- 14 A. Yes. Yes.
- Q. Would it be a good use of time for the police to report
- something like this to the fiscal?
- 17 A. At that time, from the information that I had, no.
- Q. Would it in fact be a waste of time?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. In these circumstances, would you have expected the
- 21 police to go on and charge the householders -- caution
- 22 and charge the householders with possession of
- a controlled drug?
- 24 A. That would be entirely a matter for the police, it's
- an operational matter, I would not have interfered with

1 that. 2 Okay. So this is exactly the sort of area that you Q. 3 wouldn't trespass on? 4 Α. Yes. 5 If they had been cautioned and charged, would you have Q. expected a report to be submitted on the back of that? 6 7 Α. Not everyone who's cautioned and charged is a subject of a police report. The police might, having done all 8 9 that, not submitted a report, but generally speaking, 10 yeah, once somebody's charged with an offence then, yes, I think the police would then submit a report. 11 12 Q. To your knowledge, was a report ever submitted in this 13 case? 14 I've no idea. Α. 15 Q. Can we go to paragraph 38, please. So you had refused the warrant --16 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. -- or refused to put an application for a warrant before 19 the sheriff, I should say, and you were asked, did you 20 expect the herbal matter to be seized, and you replied: 21 "If the police had found the herbal matter, I would 22 expect them to seize it, regardless of the amount, as it is a controlled substance under the Misuse of Drugs Act 23 24 1971. I would also expect the police to be dealing with very small quantities by way of a police warning rather 25

than wasting resources for very minor matters." 1 And you explained earlier in your evidence that, in 2 3 a situation of this sort, even if there were no warrant, 4 no urgency and no consent --5 Α. Yes. -- you would still expect the police to seize the drugs 6 Q. 7 8 Α. Yes. -- because giving them back --9 Q. 10 Α. Yes. -- would be illegal, essentially. 11 Q. 12 Α. Absolutely. 13 At paragraph 39 you were asked whether you expected the Q. 14 herbal matter to be tested, and you replied: 15 "I would expect the police to presumptively test the herbal matter, but as I have said, the reporting of the 16 17 same is an operational matter for the police." And again, you reiterate the point that: 18 "For minor amounts, it would be pointless to report 19 20 it through a [Standard Prosecution Report] because in 21 practice very small amounts are unlikely to be prosecuted and at best an accused might be given 22 a warning letter or a fiscal fine at the very bottom end 23 of the range of prosecutorial disposals available." 24 25 Α. Yes.

- 1 Q. And, if we can look at paragraph 40, please, again you 2 anticipated the police seizing the cannabis and the grinder and that they wouldn't be left in situ. 3 4 This may be an operational matter for the police, so 5 please tell me if it's something you're not able to help with, but do the police have the discretion in cases 6 7 like this to issue a warning? I believe so. I'm not entirely familiar with the ... 8 Α. 9 what guidance the police have, in terms of their own 10 internal processes, but it is entirely a matter for the 11 police in how they deal with these matters, and would 12 not expect them to expect an input from the 13 Procurator Fiscal as to what to do with it. Q. So in the same way that they cannot influence your 14 15 decision-making around, say, whether to prosecute a case or not, it wouldn't be within your gift to tell the 16 17 police "This is rubbish, what you should be doing here 18 is issuing a warning". 19 A. I can't tell them what to do. I could suggest that 20 that's an option that they might take, and it's entirely 21 a matter for them whether they take that advice or not. 22 And it wouldn't bother me either way what they decided to do, because, as I say, it's -- I would be trespassing 23
- 25 Q. After you concluded your call with DC Finch, having told

on their function.

24

```
1
             him that the application was not going to be put before
             a sheriff, did you ever hear anything more about this?
 2
 3
             No, I don't -- I don't believe so, and certainly if I'd
         Α.
 4
             got any calls, I mean -- this was -- looking back,
 5
             an ongoing matter, and it would have gone into, let's
             say, the next day, during the course of the day they
 6
 7
             would have contacted somebody about the -- about what
             they were doing and why they were doing it.
 8
         Q.
             Thank you.
 9
10
         Α.
             From an on-call point of view, no.
11
         Q.
             Thank you, can you bear with me just a moment?
12
         Α.
             Sure.
13
                                    (Pause)
14
         MS THOMSON: No further questions, thank you.
15
         LORD BRACADALE: Are there any Rule 9 applications? No.
16
             Thank you very much, Mr Kapadia, for coming to give
17
             evidence to the Inquiry. I'm going to adjourn now, and
18
             you'll then be free to go.
19
         THE WITNESS: Thank you.
20
                             (The witness withdrew)
21
         LORD BRACADALE: We'll take a 20-minute break at this point.
22
         (11.13 am)
23
                                (A short break)
24
         (11.35 am)
25
                             (Proceedings delayed)
```

1 (11.42 am) 2 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Mr Finch. Would you say the 3 words of the affirmation after me, please. DC ROBERT FINCH (affirmed) 4 5 Questions from MS THOMSON LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson. 6 7 MS THOMSON: Good morning, detective constable. Morning. 8 Α. 9 What is your full name, please? Q. A. Robert Finch. 10 Q. How old are you? 11 12 Α. 41. 13 How many years' police service do you have? Q. 14 Α. 15. 15 Q. There should be to your left a blue folder. Would you mind opening that up and having a look inside. You 16 17 should find inside that folder, the operational statement that you prepared on 11 May 2015. That's PIRC 18 reference 00143. 19 20 Do you have that? 21 Α. Yes, I do, yeah. And we'll come to your Inquiry statement shortly, but 22 Q. within your Inquiry statement, you do say that that 23 24 original statement is accurate at that time to the best of your knowledge and your original statement is the 25

24

25

1 best and most accurate piece of information you can provide the Inquiry. Would that be fair? 2 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. You should also have within the folder a copy of your 5 police notebook from 3 May -- sorry, 4 May 2015, which is PS03199. Is that there? 6 7 Α. Yes. And your daybook, which is PS18485? 8 Q. 9 Sorry, that's not my writing, that's somebody else's Α. 10 daybook. Oh, okay. Well, I wasn't intending to take you to it, 11 Q. 12 so we'll see how we get on. 13 Okay. Α. 14 If we need to try and hunt it down, then we will. Q. 15 In any event, we've got your notebook and there should also be your Inquiry statement, which is the 16 17 Inquiry reference 189. 18 Α. Yes. 19 Now, if it would help you to refer to any of these Q. 20 documents at any point, then you're welcome to do that. 21 I'll be putting paragraphs up on screen, if there's 22 anything you would like me to bring up, then just say so 23 and we'll do that.

If we can begin by looking at your Inquiry

statement, and it's going to come up on screen now, so

- 1 you don't have to go to the folder if you don't want to. 2 Can we go to the very last page of the statement, it's 3 27 pages long, and we see that it was signed by you on 4 15 November 2022. Your signature has been redacted, but 5 your signature should be on the hard copy --6 Yes, it was, yeah. Α. 7 -- within the folder. You saw that? Q. I noticed that, yeah. 8 Α. If we can look at the final paragraph, paragraph 145, 9 Q. 10 you say that you believe the facts stated in the statement are true and you confirm your understanding 11 12 that the statement may form part of the evidence before 13 the Inquiry and published on our website. 14 When you gave that statement, did you tell the truth 15 and do your best to give a complete and accurate account of events? 16 Yes, I did. 17 Α. 18 Can we return to the beginning of your statement, Q. 19 please, just to put your evidence in context. At 20 paragraph 3, you explain that you joined the police in 21 2007, you were a police constable until 2013, and you
- 24 A. Major investigation team.

team; is that right?

22

23

25 Q. I beg your pardon, major investigations team in

joined the MIT, which we've heard is the major incident

November 2013.

1

2 When you joined the MIT -- is it called the MIT for 3 short? 4 Α. Yeah, I would call it the MIT as an abbreviation. 5 When you joined the MIT, was that as Q. a detective constable? 6 7 Yes. I think until you do the course you're technically Α. an acting detective constable. 8 Q. I see. You've been with the MIT since November 2013, 9 10 and you were a detective constable with the MIT in May of 2015? 11 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. You were also at that time a crime scene manager. And 14 if we can look briefly at paragraph 11, you explain that 15 you completed a five-day CSM -- is that crime scene manager --16 Yes. 17 Α. 18 Q. -- course at Tulliallan and that was in February 2015. 19 So you were a detective constable and you had 20 received training in crime scene management in the 21 February of 2015, so relatively recently before the events of May 2015. 22 23 I'd like to move on to ask you questions now about 4 May of 2015, and that was your first involvement in 24 the investigation following the death of Mr Bayoh, and 25

- 1 you explain elsewhere in your statement that you were on
- 2 a rest day on 3 May?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. And returned to duty on 4 May. And you were deployed on
- 5 that day as a crime scene manager, and this was in fact
- only your second ever deployment as crime scene manager.
- 7 Tell us a little about what your role as a crime scene
- 8 manager involved?
- 9 A. So I would be briefed and deployed by a senior
- 10 investigating officer. My responsibility would be to
- 11 direct and co-ordinate crime scene staff in order to
- 12 examine and search and record scenes, whether it's
- scenes of serious crime or serious incident, not
- 14 necessarily crime, and I would be responsible to the
- staff at that scene to ensure their health and safety
- and wellbeing, so that they can function to the best of
- their ability.
- Q. If we can go to paragraph 23, please. You were shown
- 19 your daybook, I think, when you gave this statement, and
- 20 although the daybook that is in the folder today appears
- 21 to be --
- 22 A. Yeah.
- 23 Q. -- the wrong one, can you confirm that when you gave
- 24 this statement to a solicitor from the Inquiry team, you
- 25 had sight of your own daybook?

- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. And it was the right one?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. So when we see extracts from your daybook in here, in
- 5 the body of your statement, you have seen the daybook
- and satisfied yourself that it was your daybook and in
- 7 your writing?
- 8 A. Just for absolute clarity, I think at the time that I
- gave the Inquiry statement, I had the daybook in front
- of me and Mr Bruce hadn't been provided a copy at that
- point, but I referred to it throughout, giving that
- 12 statement, and very soon after that, I provided a copy
- to the Inquiry team.
- So I don't think it's quite accurate that Mr Bruce
- showed it me. I think I was referring to it whilst
- I was providing that statement.
- 17 Q. I see. In any event, when you gave the statement you
- 18 had a copy of --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- your daybook in front of you. We seem to have the
- 21 wrong one in the folder today. I gather the right one
- is now being printed and if we need to take you to it,
- we will.
- 24 A. Okay.
- 25 Q. By way of convenient shorthand, I think, the passages

1 from the daybook that you were looking at when you gave the statement have been copied over into your 2 3 statement --4 Α. Yes. 5 Q. -- and it was the correct daybook that you were looking at, at that time. All right. 6 7 So returning to paragraph 23: "My daybook ... states that I've been told I'd be 8 getting deployed. I'd scribbled some ideas of what would 9 10 be needed to kick off. I refer to page 3 of my daybook: '8.30... Instructed by DCI Hardy -- will require to 11 12 assist as CSM for death in Kirkcaldy yesterday." So this details your first involvement in the 13 14 investigation following Mr Bayoh's death and that was at 15 8.30 on the morning of 4 May? 16 Α. Yes. Can we look briefly at paragraph 25, please, just in 17 Q. terms of who else was involved by this point in time and 18 19 the hierarchy. You have explained DSU. What does "DSU" 20 stand for, please? 21 Α. Detective superintendent. Should that be DS -- okay, DS, detective superintendent: 22 Q. "... Pat Campbell was in charge of the enquiry at 23 that time. I was also briefed by DCI -- that's 24 detective chief inspector --25

1 Α. Yes. -- Keith Hardie. I don't recall any direct briefing 2 Q. 3 from DSU Campbell. DI Stuart Wilson became involved and he was more involved in daily tasking and briefing. 4 5 I don't know what Stuart's role was, maybe Deputy Senior Investigating Officer." 6 7 At paragraph 26, again you've referred to your daybook and stated, "1000", I think that would be the 8 time, 1000 hours? 9 10 Α. Yes. "... Briefing -- [Operation] Birnie -- DSUP Campbell. 11 Q. 12 PIRC -- lead enquiry." 13 So you have attended a briefing at 10 o'clock in the 14 morning of the 4th. What would be the purpose of 15 a briefing? To explain the known circumstances at that time, and to 16 Α. allocate actions to individual officers for that day. 17 If we can look at paragraph 29, please, this is another 18 Q. 19 extract from your daybook and you confirm at 20 paragraph 30 that the information in fact came from the 21 briefing and from DCI Keith Hardie: "Function, back to Dick's watched boxing. 22 Deceased became paranoid, end up at Saeed home 23 address, purple/white pills out of sock, flushed by 24 Sayed -- had a fight and stormed off -- 0500 approx 25

1 Deceased went home 0700 -- black male carrying knife cops attend -- restrained, PAVA, CS -- no effect, baton 2 strike, possibly to head, H/C ..." 3 4 Would that be handcuffs? 5 Α. Yes. "... H/C to rear, leg restraints -- went still 6 Q. 7 CPR -- ambulance -- hospital." So this is the information that you were provided 8 with at the briefing. We see there "black male carrying 9 10 knife cops attend", what was your understanding as to whether Mr Bayoh had a knife or not at the point in time 11 12 that the police arrived? 13 A. I don't think it was clarified further than that. That 14 was -- I think the sentence there "black male carrying 15 knife", that's a reference to what was reported by 16 members of the public. That's how the call was, came into police. 17 18 Q. We've heard in fact that Mr Bayoh may have been 19 handcuffed to the front, you've recorded it here 20 "handcuffs to the rear", does anything turn on that? Is 21 that of any significance? 22 I don't have any recollection to clarify that, Α. I'm afraid. 23 Q. If we can move on to paragraph 31: 24 "There's a locus at Hayfield Road where he'd [that's 25

1 Mr Bayoh] been restrained. I was told the deceased's address at ... Arran Crescent ..." 2 And then there is a reference to Martyn Dick's 3 4 address: "... a friend of the deceased. Officers themselves 5 had equipment that had been seized." 6 7 So is this a discussion around the different loci that the police were looking to? 8 Yeah, that was forming part of the briefing. 9 10 Q. Okay, okay. And at paragraph 32, you refer to your daybook again, and there's an entry that someone has now 11 12 returned to the Saeed's home address. Can you explain 13 that to me, please, "Said H/A"? A. Yes, "H/A" stands for home address. "Said" is a poor 14 15 spelling of the witness Saeed. It was explained that that address was no longer under police control, it had 16 17 been examined and returned to the occupier, which I believe was Mr Saeed. 18 19 I see. At paragraph 34, you were told -- I think this Q. 20 is still in the context of the briefing --21 Α. Yeah. -- "that the priorities were the post-mortem and to 22 Q. progress the loci that had been secured." 23 There is a separate crime scene management briefing, 24 25 and you at that point were tasked to progress the loci

- 1 at Martyn Dick's home address and Arran Crescent, which
- 2 was the deceased's home address, that was your task or
- 3 tasks for the day.
- What does it mean to progress a locus?
- 5 A. So I think the briefing by DCI Stuart Houston went into
- 6 more specific about what was expected of us that day,
- 7 but it was to -- my understanding was to photograph the
- 8 addresses and to conduct an initial assessment, to
- 9 establish if there's any evidence that's relevant to the
- investigation.
- 11 Q. Tell me about an initial assessment, what does that
- 12 involve?
- 13 A. So it would involve a thorough walk-through of
- an address, in a methodical order, a visual examination
- of what's at that address.
- 16 Q. What are you looking for?
- 17 A. At that time, I think there was mention obviously of the
- 18 knife, so we were looking if there was any obvious knife
- 19 set that was missing a particular knife. And there was
- 20 mention, I believe, of fights and disturbances. We were
- 21 looking to see if there was anything that would indicate
- 22 that that has occurred. And in general, just anything
- 23 that would indicate Mr Bayoh's movements and events that
- evening going in, leading into the morning.
- 25 Q. Okay. Can we look at paragraph 36, please, where you

1 explain the procedure, I think, after a locus has been seized by the police. You say: 2 3 "Generally, hypothetically for this one and from 4 experience from other incidents, we would ensure they had alternative accommodation and contact details ..." 5 So "they" being the householders? 6 7 Occupiers, yeah. Α. Q. Occupiers: 8 9 "... the moment we could return that locus back to them they would be contacted." 10 So it's you who would be taking the householder's 11 12 contact details? 13 No, not necessarily. No, not necessarily myself. It Α. 14 would be -- it was a large inquiry team that day, so 15 I would expect and anticipate that somebody has their contact details and will keep them updated throughout 16 the day. 17 That's fine. I beg your pardon, that is entirely my 18 Q. 19 fault, I meant "you" as in the police. The police, yeah. 20 Α. 21 Q. It is the police who would be taking contact details for 22 the occupiers, they would ensure they had alternative accommodation and that the police held their contact 23 details so they could be notified when they could get 24 25 entry to their home again:

1 "They would most likely be contacted to provide 2 a statement to the enquiry team at some point, but I 3 can't give specifics on this one because my task that 4 day was purely to process the addresses. I don't know 5 if it was from the briefing but I did have an awareness 6 at the time that Mr Bayoh lived with his partner and his 7 infant child, that gave me a huge sense of empathy so I do recall that." 8

- 9 A. Yeah.
- Q. I appreciate this was a large inquiry, there were
 a number of police officers at each of the loci, and
 I don't believe that you yourself were responsible for
 seizing Martyn Dick's address or the address at
 Arran Crescent, that had been done by colleagues before
 you arrived at either address. Is that correct?
- 16 A. Correct, yes.
- But just as a generalisation, as you've offered some 17 Q. 18 information to the Inquiry about the procedure where 19 an occupier is asked to vacate when their home address 20 is seized, they provide their contact details, so you 21 can let them know when they can come back, I wanted to 22 ask just a couple of questions around that. In particular, I wanted to know what would happen if the 23 24 occupier needed to get back into their house for 25 something.

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. Would they, in the ordinary course of things, be allowed
- 3 to come back into their house for something?
- A. Yeah, we would facilitate that, or to give you
- 5 an example, if they wanted to collect clothing or
- a particular item, and it wasn't deemed relevant to the
- 7 investigation, we would facilitate that. We'd either
- 8 supervise entry or collect those belongings on their
- 9 behalf.
- 10 Q. Okay, so if it wasn't relevant to the inquiry, you would
- either supervise their return to the property to collect
- the items or you would do it on their behalf?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. You mentioned clothing, what about things like car keys?
- 15 A. It would depend on the investigation, if that vehicle
- wasn't relevant to the investigation, then yes.
- 17 Q. Pet food?
- 18 A. Absolutely, yeah.
- 19 Q. Breast milk?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. A breast pump?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Medicine?
- A. Yes, but if it wasn't relevant to the investigation.
- 25 Q. You can think of any reasons why people might not be

- 1 allowed to access these things if they weren't relevant 2 to the investigation? A. If there was potential that other evidence could be 3 4 disturbed or disposed of, which, as I said, we would 5 either collect on their behalf or supervise the collection of that, those belongings or property. 6 7 Q. Okay. And if the things that the householder hoped to get from the house weren't relevant to the inquiry and 8 9 there was no risk of other evidence being disturbed or 10 disposed of, would you anticipate any problem with them being able to get these things back? 11 12 Α. No. No. Can we look at paragraph 37, please, where you explain Q.
- Q. Can we look at paragraph 37, please, where you explain
 your role on 4 May. Your role was to liaise with
 forensic and scenes of crime staff, co-ordinate them and
 complete a plan that comes from the forensic strategy
 meeting:
- 18 "I was a conduit between the forensic examination
 19 team and the SIO."
- That's the senior investigating officer?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. "I was assigned two loci eventually. I was asked to do
 23 an initial assessment at each of them. I was to task
 24 the Scenes of Crime Officer ... to take general
 25 photographs of the locus, to do an initial assessment

1 and see if there was any evidence relevant to the enquiry." 2 3 So that was your role on the day. 4 At paragraph 38, in terms of what you were looking 5 for, and I asked you some questions about this a moment 6 ago, you say: 7 "I wasn't given specific information about what may be relevant but from memory it was passed that Mr Bayoh 8 9 had possession of a knife. It was passed that there 10 were potential drugs, there was mention of these purple and white pills that had been flushed down the toilet. 11 12 My understanding was we were looking for any loci with 13 an obvious knife set with one missing, we were looking 14 for any controlled drug or substance or legal high, and 15 there was also mention of fights between witnesses and the deceased, so we were looking for any evidence of 16 17 disturbance within those loci. Also looking for generic things like clothing, anything indicative of people's 18 movements such as receipts or mobile phones. I don't 19 20 remember any of that being specifically said, these are 21 just things that I would generally be aware of at any 22 crime scene or any locus that we have secured as part of an enquiry." 23 So you've explained why you might be looking for 24 a knife, why you might be looking for drugs. You also 25

1 mention clothing, why might clothing be relevant to 2 the inquiry? A. CCTV, if any colleagues are capturing on CCTV, we have 3 4 got clothing as a visual cue of what to look for. Not 5 in this particular case, but clothing, if there has been a fight or a disturbance, that clothing may be ripped or 6 7 damaged that would corroborate a struggle has taken 8 place. Whose clothing were you looking for or interested in? 9 10 Α. It was, in this particular case, it was just note any clothing out that was visible for CCTV. My 11 12 understanding, at that time, was the relevant clothing 13 at the time had been seized already, so it was more 14 a focus on a jacket or a coat that might help CCTV 15 movements. I want to ask you some questions now about your 16 Q. 17 attendance at Martyn Dick and Kirsty MacLeod's home 18 address. 19 If we can go to paragraph 51, please. And here you 20 explain that you arrived at their address at 2 o'clock 21 in the afternoon. You met two scene examiners, 22 Gordon Young and Judith Harley. You met them in the street, you grouped in the street before entering 23 24 together.

Again, you confirm Martyn Dick's address had earlier

25

address."

- been secured prior to you starting duty, so you weren't

 involved in the decision to seize his house or the

 actual seizing of his house?

 A. Correct.
- 9 I [His] address had earlier been secured prior to me starting duty and that he was the friend of the deceased. The deceased had been in the address at some point in the early hours of 3 May. I remember there was at least one officer on locus protection, I was happy that it was sufficient to maintain the integrity of the
- You were aware that the address had already been secured. Were you told on what authority the address had been secured?
- 15 A. Yeah. I was told that it was permission granted by the occupier.
- Q. When an occupier grants permission for their home to be seized, and subject to this initial assessment and photographing and so on, would you expect that to be recorded in some way, so there couldn't be any dispute about it in the future?
- 22 A. I can tell you how I would capture such permission.
- 23 Q. Yes.

11

A. I would build that to within the witness statement to make it clear that we've explained, you know, that

that witness.

7

- they're under no obligation to do so, it had been
 explained why, you know, the purpose of doing that and
 what we're looking to achieve and the fact that if they
 become uncomfortable at any point, they can withdraw
 that permission. And I would -- like I say, I would
 capture that within the body of a signed statement from
- Q. Now, if the locus was secured before the witnesses'

 statements were taken, if it had been thought

 appropriate to ask them to go back to the police

 station, for example, to give their statement, how might

 you capture that information?
- 13 A. Probably by means of a paragraph within my notebook and
 14 ask the witness to sign that.
- Q. So you would record in your notebook, then, that the
 witness understood that they were under no obligation to
 allow you to seize and presumably enter and move around

 --
- 19 A. I'm not aware of any set of guidelines around that, but
 20 that's certainly how I would approach it.
- Q. And why do you think that would be an important thing to do? Why is that your practice?
- A. To withstand future scrutiny that, you know, we've

 demonstrated a level of fairness and explanation to the

 witness.

- 1 Q. So this would be an audit trail, if you like, or paper
- 2 trail --

Α.

3

Yeah.

- 4 Q. -- that would confirm that you had ensured that the
- 5 witness realised they were under no obligation, you
- 6 would have explained the purpose, what you were hoping
- 7 to achieve, and that they could withdraw their
- 8 permission. And you would capture that either in
- 9 a statement or if the statement was being taken later in
- a paragraph in your notebook, which you say you would
- 11 have them sign?
- 12 A. Mm-hmm.
- Q. Okay. When you go to a locus as a crime scene manager
- 14 and you're aware that colleagues have already seized
- that locus, and they tell you that they have the
- householder's permission, do you rely on what you were
- being told or would you ask to see what's written in the
- notebook or what's been embodied within a statement?
- 19 A. So, on this occasion, it was a major investigation and
- I was directed to that address by a senior investigating
- 21 officer, so I have to be satisfied that the SIO is
- 22 content with permission being granted, and that,
- 23 you know, there's a clear record of that. I believe it
- 24 was recorded on HOLMES, the HOLMES system, this inquiry,
- 25 so there should be a clear record of that. But I'm

1		satisfied if I'm instructed by an SIO that they've given
2		that level of scrutiny and prior to instructing me.
3	Q.	So it wouldn't perhaps be your place to say, "Before
4		I go through the front door, I'd like to see the
5		notebook, I'd like to see the statement
6	Α.	Yeah, I didn't have any contact with those officers, so
7		it was purely on the instruction from the SIO.
8	Q.	I'd like to ask a few questions about scene entry logs,
9		if we can go to paragraph 53, please, you say:
LO		"There was no scene entry log at that scene.
L1		A scene entry log is a legal document that logs any
L2		activity in that address, any persons going in and out.
L3		I don't know why there wasn't a scene entry log.
L 4		I don't think there was any reason provided to me as to
L5		why a scene entry log hadn't been started. I thought of
L 6		adding retrospective entries. There is a specific
L7		section at the start of the scene entry log to record
L8		any persons that have entered the locus prior to the
L9		scene entry log being started, but I don't recall
20		filling that in. That was simply information that
21		wasn't available to me."
22		So you describe a scene entry log as "a legal
23		document that logs any activity at the address, persons
24		going in and out", you don't know why there wasn't
25		a scene entry log when you arrived at Martyn Dick's home

1		address, would you have expected there to have been
2		a scene entry log up and running by the point that you
3		arrived?
4	Α.	Yeah, I think so. I don't know if there was some
5		confusion that, you know, we were investigating a death
6		rather than a crime. So I don't know if there's
7		confusion there. I'm speculating. But I would have
8		expected a scene entry log to be started the previous
9		day and maintained.
LO	Q.	Did you do anything about the fact that there wasn't
L1		a scene entry log?
L2	A.	Yeah, immediately instructed the officers to start one.
L3	Q.	If we can now turn to paragraph 62, please or, sorry
L 4		59, I beg your pardon. This is an extract now from your
L5		notebook:
L 6		"Attended Dick/MacLeod home address
L7		Instructed officers to commence scene entry log at
L8		1358
L9		Entered full forensic protection. Still photos.
20		No sign of disturbance."
21		So here you record your instruction that the scene
22		entry log has to be commenced. The paragraph that we
23		referred to a few moments ago made mention of the
24		possibility of retrospective entries, you considered
25		making retrospective entries, but didn't. Can you

1 explain, please, what retrospective entries are and why you didn't make retrospective entries on this occasion? 2 Yeah, so within a scene entry log, there are a number of 3 Α. 4 pages that are coloured yellow, and that is an area in 5 which we can record officers that have been within that -- or that we know that have been within that locus or 6 7 other persons beyond officers that have been within that address prior to the scene log being started. 8 9 To give you an example, if officers need to rush in 10 for preservation of life to give CPR, they wouldn't have time to start a scene entry log. So that's an area 11 12 where we can record who has been in, what action they've 13 taken. The white pages then move on once the scene 14 log's up and running, that becomes a log of who enters 15 and why and also persons responsible for maintaining the address. 16 17 Because in this instance, the log was started the previous day, there was an unknown number of officers 18 19 that had been assigned locus protection duties that 20 I didn't have that information available at that time. 21 When you say the log was started the previous day, do Q. 22 you in fact mean the log hadn't been started the

A. Sorry. When the locus protection had commenced the previous day, there had been any number of officers

previous day and that --

23

24

25

1 between then and 2 minutes to 2, when the log was started, I didn't know who those officers were. 2 So was it simply an impossible task to --3 Q. 4 Α. Yeah. -- try to ascertain that information and make the 5 Q. 6 retrospective entries? 7 Α. Yeah. 8 Q. Okay. 9 If we could go now to paragraph 52, please. Sorry, 10 62, I beg your pardon. You say: "I was briefed to make an initial assessment ..." 11 12 And we discussed what that involves a moment ago, 13 you say you were briefed to make that initial 14 assessment, so that was an instruction from a more 15 senior officer? 16 Α. Yes. "The best and detailed account is in my daybook. I've 17 Q. written at page 8: 'Jacket hanging on banister.' I think 18 the process of my thinking at that time was for CCTV 19 20 teams to look for clothing of the witnesses." 21 Again you mentioned CCTV and the relevance of clothing earlier in your evidence. 22 23 At paragraph 63, you record: 24 "At page 8 I also wrote 'No signs of disturbance' and 'Herbal matter in jar in bed drawer.' I drew 25

1 sketches of the locus. I sketched downstairs and 2 upstairs." 3 So the initial assessment you've described as 4 involving a methodical walk around, and you're very much 5 using your eyes, you're looking for things that might be of relevance to the inquiry, so you've recorded here: 6 "... 'No signs of a disturbance' and 'Herbal matter 7 in jar in bed drawer.'" 8 9 Who was it that noticed the herbal matter during the 10 initial assessment? Was it yourself or a colleague? I've got a vague -- it's obviously a large passage of 11 Α. 12 time since, my recollection is it was drawn to my 13 attention by Judith Harley, who's one of the scene 14 examiners. One of the tasks was to record the locus by 15 means of still photography, so we would always allow that to be done before I would enter, just so that's 16 17 captured prior to any disturbance, police disturbance, within that address. So, from memory, I think it was 18 19 Judith Harley that brought that to my attention. Okay. Can you describe where this herbal matter was 20 Q. 21 noticed, was seen to be? 22 Pardon, sorry? I didn't hear the question. Α. Sorry, can you describe where the herbal matter was seen 23 Q. to be? It's described as a bed drawer. Is that 24 a bedroom drawer or is it a drawer in the bed itself? 25

1	Α.	It was within a divan bed, so there was a pull-out
2		drawer in a base of the bed. By the time I saw it, the
3		drawer was open and it was clearly sitting on top of
4		that drawer on open display.
5	Q.	Okay.
6		At paragraph 66, again another entry from your
7		notebook, you say:
8		"1500-1505 Re-entered with Judith [Harley] to assess
9		herbal matter in bed drawer, main bedroom.
L 0		2x grinders trace amounts."
11		At 67:
12		"We re-entered to assess the herbal matter. The
13		drawer in the nearest bedroom was open and the jar was
L 4		obvious. 2 grinders."
L5		So your recollection today is that it was
16		Judith Harley who had drawn your attention to the
L7		substance and the grinders. And you say that by the
L8		time that you saw them, they were on open display within
19		a drawer in the divan of the bed in the main bedroom.
20		Now, there's evidence before the Chair from both
21		householders, both occupiers, Martyn Dick and
22		Kirsty MacLeod, that the drawer was closed when they
23		vacated their house, when the police took seizure of the
24		house, and it must have been opened by the police. Is
2.5		that something that you can comment on?

- 1 A. It's possible. Certainly my recollection is by the time
- I got to the bedroom, it was open. We certainly weren't
- doing an intrusive search, we would have opened drawers,
- 4 certainly in the kitchen, for the assessment around the
- 5 knives. But certainly, by the time I saw that, the
- 6 drawer was open.
- 7 Q. Okay.
- 8 A. I've got no recollection of opening that drawer.
- 9 Q. As you said earlier in your evidence, the locus had in
- 10 fact been seized the previous day. Can you say how many
- officers had been in the house --
- 12 A. No.
- Q. -- between the point in time that the locus was seized
- and you commencing the scene log?
- 15 A. No.
- Q. No. And no log was being kept so we don't know who they
- 17 were?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. Okay. But your evidence is that by the time it was
- drawn to your attention, the drawer was open?
- 21 A. Correct.
- Q. And the substance and the grinders were on display?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And you can't assist us with anything that happened
- 25 before that point in time?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. You said you wouldn't have been carrying out, I think
- 3 you used the word "intrusive" or "invasive" search, can
- 4 you help us to understand the difference between what
- 5 you call an initial assessment and what the public might
- 6 think of as a search? Is there a difference?
- 7 A. Yeah. Depending on the circumstances again, but yeah,
- 8 you know, a structured intrusive search would be one
- 9 undertaken by or under the supervision of a police
- search adviser, and would be recorded. The wording in
- 11 the document is "intrusive search" and that would be
- 12 every cupboard, every drawer is searched through
- 13 thoroughly. The initial assessment would have been, as
- 14 I've already described it, a general visual assessment
- 15 at that address. Potentially involving opening drawers,
- but certainly not a thorough detailed search of the
- 17 contents of those drawers.
- Q. Would it be fair to say that it's a question of degree?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And that both involve you looking for evidence?
- 21 A. I'm sorry, I don't understand that.
- Q. That both an initial assessment and a structured search
- 23 involve you looking for things that are of evidential
- value to your inquiry?
- 25 A. Yes, yeah.

- 1 Q. And both may involve the opening of drawers? 2 Yes. Α. 3 Q. Okay. 4 Can we move on to paragraph 68, please. So the 5 herbal matter and grinders had been brought to your 6 attention, and you say: 7 "From memory I think I rang DS More or DI Wilson and was advised to phone the on-call Fiscal to seek a drugs 8 search warrant. I can't recall why we needed the search 9 10 warrant in addition to the consent." If I can ask you a few questions about that, please. 11 12 You had been told by a senior officer that the occupiers 13 had consented to the seizure of the house. What did you 14 understand to be the scope of the consent that they had 15 given to the police? At that point, we're carrying out enquiries into the 16 death of Mr Bayoh, so that's the scope of the search. 17 So when we've located drugs that becomes outwith that 18 19 scope, we've identified criminality there. Q. Okay. But did you understand then that the householders 20 21 had consented not only to the seizure of their house, but that for it to be searched for evidence relevant to 22
- 24 A. Yes, that was my understanding.

23

25 Q. So we've heard some evidence that there might be

the investigation into Mr Bayoh's death?

25

1 a distinction between the seizure of a property and the 2 search of the property. 3 Α. Yeah. 4 Q. And it was your understanding that the occupiers had consented to both insofar as it was relevant to the 5 police investigation into the circumstances of 6 7 Mr Bayoh's death? I'm basing that on the instruction from the SIO that 8 Α. 9 that existed, yeah. 10 Q. And, of course, what you have now encountered is, on the face of it, a controlled drug, and you've explained 11 12 that's why there was a need to approach a fiscal for 13 a warrant, because the drug that you had found was 14 perhaps not of evidential value in terms of the 15 investigation into the circumstances of Mr Bayoh's death. 16 17 A. Correct. 18 Q. Did I understand that correctly? 19 Correct. Α. Q. Okay. 20 21 So as we see from paragraph 68, you took advice from a more senior colleague and you were advised to phone 22 23 the on-call fiscal. 24 You've explained now, although your statement says:

"I can't recall why we needed the search warrant in

addition to the consent." 1 2 If I've understood your evidence correctly, you have 3 explained today that it was because what you had found 4 wasn't directly relevant to the inquiry itself, but it 5 was evidence of criminality of another sort? 6 Correct, yeah. Α. 7 What quantity of drugs are we dealing with here? Q. Very small. I think at one point I made a reference in 8 Α. 9 my daybook or my notebook that it was probably less than 10 a gram. Is that what the police might think of as a personal 11 Q. 12 quantity rather than a dealer quantity? 13 Yeah, definitely. Α. 14 Would you usually call the fiscal for a warrant for such Q. 15 a small quantity? It would depend on the situation. Not necessarily, no. 16 Α. We heard evidence this morning from the on-call fiscal, 17 Q. 18 whom you called, he said in his experience it was rare 19 to be called by the police, on-call or in the office, 20 for such a small quantity. 21 Α. Yeah. 22 Have you called the fiscal before about asking for Q. a warrant for less than a gram of cannabis? 23 24 Α. No.

Have you done it since?

25

Q.

24

25

1 Α. No. 2 So this is the only time in your career that you've Q. 3 called the fiscal to seek a warrant for less than a gram 4 of cannabis? 5 As far as I recall, yeah. Okay. Have there been other cases in the course of your 6 Q. 7 career where you have come across small quantities of cannabis or other drugs? 8 9 A. I can't recall to that minute amount, no. 10 Sorry, perhaps during a drugs death investigation, we've come across a grinder with trace amounts that 11 12 would be seized, if a person has died within that 13 property. But no. 14 Q. So will there have been other occasions where you've 15 stumbled across a small amount of drugs in the course of your career? 16 During death investigations, yeah. 17 Α. 18 Q. All right. 19 How did you feel about being asked to call the 20 fiscal out of hours with a view to applying for 21 a warrant for such a small quantity of drugs? 22 It was an instruction by a senior officer. I felt Α. reassured at the time of day, it was not long after the 23

usual court, daily court business finishing up, so I can

see that it was round about 5 o'clock, so I was

comforted by that.

1

It was your understanding that the occupiers had 2 Q. 3 consented to their property being subjected to a search? 4 Α. Yes. 5 If that consent had already been given, was any Q. consideration given to asking them whether they would 6 7 consent to effectively a drugs search? I can't comment on what the SIO's decision-making was 8 Α. 9 around that. 10 Q. In any event, you are acting on an instruction to contact the out-of-hours fiscal, so let me ask you some 11 12 questions now about how that call went. 13 Α. Okay. 14 The fiscal you spoke with was a Mr Kapadia and we heard Q. 15 evidence from him this morning. So he has explained to us the processes and the procedures that are in place 16 17 when the police need to contact the fiscal out of hours 18 already. 19 Let's look at paragraph 69, which is an entry in 20 your daybook, you say: 21 "I've written in my daybook ... 'Relating to investigation? 22 23 Putting pen through it 24 No wanting to bother Sheriff 1700 Spoke to A/N - PF 25

1		Operational matter
2		From prosecution point of view nothing will be
3		done'."
4		Paragraph 70, you say:
5		"I rang the PF and I've informed him of the
6		circumstances. He told us we weren't being granted
7		permission to approach the Sheriff for a warrant and it
8		was an operational matter for the police."
9		Again, if we move down just a little bit, you go to
10		your notebook, and similar information is recorded:
11		" 4 May 2015 1700. Spoke to PF DEV KAPADIA.
12		Not authorised to approach JP/Sheriff for warrant.
13		Prosecution would do nothing. Operational matter.
14		1710. Instruction by DI Wilson to recover substance
15		and caution occupiers'."
16		Can you add to that in terms of your recollection of
17		the conversation that you had with Mr Kapadia?
18	Α.	I don't think I can speculate. There'd have been
19		a discussion around about what's the connection and
20		relevance to the if any, to the death of Mr Bayoh,
21		what quantities would you estimate it to be, is there
22		other evidence within the address to indicate that,
23		you know, we're actually dealing with a supply case? Or
24		is it personal? Is there any information or
25		intelligence in the background that would indicate it's

1 anything other than a personal amount of controlled 2 drug? 3 And in this case, was there any evidence within the Q. 4 address to suggest that it was a supply case rather than 5 personal use? 6 Not that I had seen, no. Α. 7 And was there any intelligence in the background to Q. suggest that the householders were supplying drugs or 8 9 that their property had been used in some way for the 10 supply of drugs? 11 Α. No. 12 Q. Okay. 13 If we can return to paragraph 69, these are your 14 notes, of course, but you recall putting pen through it. 15 Was this you saying you were putting a pen through it or was it Mr Kapadia saying he'd be putting a pen through 16 17 it? 18 Α. That's not a term I would -- I would -- that refers to 19 the fiscal. I don't have the power to put a pen through 20 it, as that terminology mentions there. And what would you understand that to mean, putting 21 Q. 22 a pen through something? The bottom sentence there, the prosecution wouldn't 23 Α. 24 progress that, it wouldn't be in the public interest to

do anything with that.

25

1

Q. Okay. And why would that be? Just because we're dealing with such small quantities. 2 Α. You've also recorded, "No wanting to bother Sheriff", do 3 Q. 4 you recall anything about that part of the discussion? 5 Yeah, I -- it's not a direct quote, but I think that the Α. gist was that he didn't want to disturb a sheriff at 6 7 that time of day based on the small amounts. Q. "'Operational matter 8 9 From prosecution point of view -- nothing will be done'." 10 "From prosecution point of view, nothing will be 11 12 done", that seems quite straightforward. 13 What did you understand Mr Kapadia to be telling you 14 when he said words to the effect of "from prosecution 15 point of view, nothing will be done"? As I've said, it wouldn't be in the public interest 16 Α. 17 to -- for example, if a report was submitted to the PF regarding those circumstances, no further action would 18 be taken. 19 And you've recorded there "operational matter", and 20 Q. 21 again, in paragraph 70: "[Mr Kapadia] told us we weren't being granted 22 permission to approach the Sheriff ... and it was 23 an operational matter for the police." 24 What did you understand by "it was an operational 25

- matter for the police"? 1 2 It was exactly that, it's a choice for police to make as Α. to what further action, if any, is taken. 3 4 Q. If we can scroll down a little, please. So you've had the call with the fiscal, his notes are to the effect 5 that the call lasted for about five minutes, would that 6 7 accord with your recollection? 8 Α. Yes. And he has given evidence that he declined to put your 9 Q. 10 application for a warrant before a sheriff, and told you 11 it was an operational matter. We see at the bottom of 12 paragraph 71: 13 "... Instruction by DI Wilson to recover substance and caution occupiers." 14 15 Should we understand then that after the call with 16 the fiscal, you took further advice from DI Wilson? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. Did you make DI Wilson aware that the fiscal was not 19 willing to put the application before a sheriff? Yes, I will have done, yeah. 20 Α. 21 Q. And DI Wilson told you to recover the substance and
- A. Yes.

 Q. Can you help us to understand the authority on which you

 went on to recover the substance if you didn't have

caution the occupiers?

22

1 a warrant and you didn't have consent? 2 Yeah. SIO instruction. But my understanding, I'm duty Α. 3 bound to prevent and detect crime and that -- and remove 4 that substance from the public for their safety. So 5 ultimately, I was duty bound to take action and seize 6 that. 7 Q. You were also instructed to caution the occupiers? 8 Α. Yes. How did you feel about that instruction? 9 Q. 10 Α. I don't recall having any feeling. Okay. Would it be normal police practice, can you say, 11 Q. 12 to caution someone for possession of less than a gram of 13 cannabis? Yeah, absolutely, yeah, if --14 Α. 15 Q. Okay. 16 I mean, the best example I could give you would be a stop and search in the street and recovering maybe 17 18 a single joint. That person would be cautioned that if 19 the contents of that joint is tested and is found to contain an illegal substance, they may be reported for 20 the consideration of a prosecution. 21 22 Q. Okay. And do you know in this case whether the 23 24 householders were in fact reported for a consideration of prosecution? 25

- I personally didn't report them. I couldn't -- I think 1 Α. in my statement, it goes on to explain later on that the 2 next day, I was instructed to hand over all productions 3 4 and take no further part in the investigation, so that 5 was prior to an opportunity to field test that item. So, in my experience, it looked to be herbal cannabis, 6 but I didn't have an opportunity to do a field test, so 7 as such I couldn't put a prosecution report in regarding 8 that. 9 10 Q. Would it be normal police practice to caution and charge an individual for possession of controlled drugs before 11 12 a field test or a presumptive test has been carried out 13 to confirm they are in fact drugs? Not caution and charge, there's a statutory drugs 14 Α. 15 caution, and I think that the exact wording is later in my Inquiry statement. 16 I think it is. Let's have a look at that now. 17 Q. 18 Α. Okay. 19 It's paragraph 83, I think. Paragraph 83: Q. 20 "I have been referred to my notebook ... 1842 A/N's..." 21 22 Which you explain in the next paragraph is "above nominals"? 23
- 24 A. Yeah.
- Q. So that's Kirsty MacLeod and Martyn Dick.

"... A/N's read drug caution verbatim:- 'I have 1 reason to believe that the substances found within your 2 3 home address is a controlled drug under MDA' ..." 4 Is that the Misuse of Drugs Act? 5 Α. Yes. "... '1971. Should analysis of the substances prove 6 Q. 7 positive you will be reported for offences under the act. I must caution you that you are not obliged to say 8 9 anything in reply but anything you do say will be noted and may be used in evidence. Do you understand?'" 10 Both understand; neither made a reply. 11 12 And again you've explained the shorthand you used --13 Yeah. Α. 14 -- at paragraph 84. Q. 15 That was the caution that was read over, so should we understand that they were cautioned but not cautioned 16 17 and charged? Correct, yeah. 18 Α. 19 All right. And you've explained that the following day Q. 20 you were asked to hand over productions. We may hear 21 evidence that the PIRC began to be incrementally more 22 involved in the investigation from about that point onwards. But you certainly didn't follow this up; this 23 concluded your involvement, essentially, in this matter? 24 Correct, yeah. Yeah. 25 Α.

1		(Pause)
2	Q.	Okay.
3		You've explained in your statement and in your
4		evidence that you were essentially acting on
5		instructions, both in terms of making contact with the
6		fiscal, also cautioning the householders.
7		Would you ordinarily go to a senior officer for
8		instructions in these circumstances, or would you in
9		other circumstances have your discretion?
10	Α.	No. On throughout my time in the major investigation
11		team, whenever I've been involved in an MI, you take no
12		action without explicit instruction from an SIO, whether
13		that's verbally or a typed printed action from the
14		HOLMES computer system, there is nothing done I don't
15		act autonomously in any aspect of an MI.
16	Q.	If you had been able to act autonomously, would you have
17		done anything differently?
18	A.	No.
19	Q.	Okay.
20		We've heard some evidence, albeit limited evidence,
21		from Mr Kapadia this morning that the police do have the
22		discretion in at least some circumstances to issue
23		a warning to a person
24	A.	Yeah.
25	0.	as an alternative, perhaps, to cautioning them or

25

Α.

Yes.

1 submitting a report to the fiscal. Is that something you've ever done? 2 In the areas I work at, I'm not that familiar with 3 Α. 4 a recorded police warning and when I did work in 5 response and in uniform it wasn't a tool available to police, so I'm not overly familiar with it. I'm aware 6 7 that it exists and in circumstances that it can be used. Q. Are you able to help us -- and please say if you 8 9 can't -- with whether it's a tool that might be used 10 where a person has been found to be in possession of a very small quantity of cannabis? 11 12 Α. Yeah, I'm not overly familiar with the exact guidelines 13 or whether this circumstance would fit. I want to say yes, but I can't be certain. 14 15 Q. All right, thank you. Can I move on to ask you now about your involvement 16 17 with the other locus, that is Mr Bayoh's home address on 18 Arran Crescent. 19 I believe you also had some involvement as crime 20 scene manager on 4 May with the Arran Crescent property. 21 What was the nature of your role at Arran Crescent? Was 22 it identical to --23 Α. Yes. -- the role that you performed --24 Q.

1	Q.	at Martyn Dick's home address?
2		So what, then, was the legal basis for you entering
3		and assessing and potentially searching Mr Bayoh's home
4		address?
5	Α.	Yeah, so I think when I provided my Inquiry statement
6		I was it was unclear. I think, having reviewed my
7		daybook, I'm content that permission was given for that
8		one as well, or certainly that's the instruction that
9		I received from the SIO, that permission had been
10		granted.
11	Q.	Let's look at paragraph 90 of your statement, please.
12		This is in relation to Mr Bayoh's address:
13		"I attended [at Arran Crescent at] 7 in the evening.
14		I have been asked if I know the legal basis to search
15		this property. No, and this really jumps out to me when
16		I reviewed my statement. I can only answer that with,
17		at the time, it was SIO-led. I'd have had the firm
18		belief that we were acting lawfully and within the
19		powers of either permission from the occupier or SIO
20		policy in conjunction with the PF and the PIRC, but
21		I don't have any specific note in my notebook or my
22		daybook nor memory as to what that was, whether it was
23		a warrant, permission from the occupier, or otherwise."
24		And you said a moment ago you've clearly reflected
25		on this.

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. Before I took you to that paragraph, you said that you
- 3 were satisfied that it was permission or consent from
- 4 the householder.
- 5 A. Yeah. I don't have any clear recollection but I know,
- if you refer to my daybook, I think there's a briefing.
- 7 On the top right of the page, there's a bullet point
- 8 that says, "Warrant? -- permission granted".
- 9 I think having reviewed that, because it's right at
- 10 the start of the briefing, it refers to both locuses.
- 11 Q. Thank you, and that's in relation to both loci, so this
- 12 was the daybook that was missing --
- 13 A. Yeah.
- 14 Q. -- and still will be missing from the blue folder, but
- I believe we might now have it. Perhaps can we let
- DC Finch have a look, and would it be possible to put
- that on the screen?
- 18 A. Thank you.
- 19 (Pause)
- Q. Detective constable, I'm going to ask for your help here
- 21 to see if you can help us to find that entry. I think
- 22 you might be able to locate it more quickly than I can.
- 23 A. Yeah. I don't see that it's paginated, but I think
- perhaps page 7.
- Q. Oh, yes. Top of page 7.

```
1
         A. Yeah. So the previous page is the start of the briefing
             at 10 o'clock in the morning, and then that goes over
 2
             the page, "Warrant? -- permission given."
 3
 4
         Q. Just for completeness, if we might go to the previous
 5
             page first, near the top of that, in fact at the very
 6
             top:
 7
                 "1000 hours.
                 "Briefing.
 8
 9
                 "PIRC - lead enquiry.
                 "5 loci."
10
                 And then there's a discussion about the five
11
12
             different loci, including Hayfield Road, Arran Crescent,
13
             Martyn Dick's home address, amongst others.
14
                 Then at the top of page 7:
15
                 "Warrant? -- permission given."
                 So the issue of lawful authority to enter and search
16
17
             these loci appears to have been discussed at the
18
             briefing; would that be fair?
19
             Yes.
         Α.
             And the possibility of a warrant being required appears
20
         Q.
21
             to have been raised?
             I think that was my personal consideration: do I need
22
         Α.
             a warrant before I attend at these addresses?
23
             And you have written -- this is your handwriting?
24
         Q.
25
         Α.
             Yes.
```

- Q. These are your notes, "Permission given". So you've been provided that information?

 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. That has satisfied you that there was no need for
- 5 a warrant?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. You said earlier in your evidence that so far as
- 8 Martyn Dick was concerned, you took his having given
- 9 permission on authority from a more senior officer, you
- 10 didn't ask to see a note in a notebook or see his
- 11 statement. Was it the same in relation to
- 12 Collette Bell's home address --
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. -- at Arran Crescent?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. So you were provided with that information by a more senior officer and you didn't look behind it?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Can we go to paragraph 93, I just have a few questions
- in relation to -- sorry, we're going back to the Inquiry
- 21 statement. I'm sorry. In fact, we were at
- 22 paragraph 90, so let's just pick up from there, please.
- 23 Paragraph 90 is where there's a discussion about the
- lawful basis and we've explored that.
- 25 If we look for completeness at paragraph 91, you say

1 you're certain: "... that we'd have acted on clear instructions at 2 3 the time, whether it was for warrant permission or 4 an SIO policy. I wouldn't have done that unless 5 I thought I was acting legally and with absolute fairness." 6 7 A. Yeah. Q. If there had been any question in your mind as to 8 9 whether the householders had provided consent for the 10 work that you were being asked to carry out, what would you have done? 11 12 A. I'd have queried that with the SIO. 13 Q. If we can now go to paragraph 93, please. It's 7.20 pm 14 by the time you've entered Arran Crescent. There's 15 a reference there to seizing a watch, which I think had been found in a garden. 16 A. Yeah. 17 "I've taken full forensic precautions", which you 18 Q. 19 explain by reference to your daybook to mean gloves, 20 overshoes, suit and mask. What was the purpose of taking full forensic precautions? 21 22 In hindsight, it was being overly precautious. As I've Α. mentioned, it was my second ever scene. There was no 23 indication of any forensic examinations requiring to be 24 done at that locus, there was no mention of bleeding 25

25

1 injuries. I think I was just being overly precautious. 2 Had you taken those precautions when you went into Q. 3 Martyn Dick's home address? 4 Α. I can't recall without referring to the scene entry log. 5 I think I probably would have done. And if you had, or assuming that you did, would you have 6 Q. 7 worn the same clothing --8 Α. Yes. -- when you went into Arran Crescent or would you have 9 Q. 10 changed into a fresh set of clothing? I'd have, yeah, an entirely new set of protective 11 Α. 12 clothing. Paragraph 94, you've explained that you noticed fridge 13 Q. 14 magnets on the floor and there were fridge magnets on 15 the footpath outside the property, a watch strap was 16 broken, and photographs were taken and there was recovery by the scenes examiners. 17 18 At paragraph 95 you say: 19 "I don't see that I've put it in my statement, but 20 looking back now, that is indicative of a potential 21 disturbance, potentially fridge magnets were pulled off 22 a fridge and a watch strap with one side potentially pulled off. There was a small flatscreen television on 23 the floor, possibly indicative of being knocked over." 24

Were there any other signs of a disturbance within

Arran Crescent that you recall?

1

2 Not that I recall, no. Α. Was there anything more of evidential value within the 3 Q. 4 kitchen that you recall? A. I recall seizing three knives from the kitchen and 5 I recall, I think it was a red coloured rucksack on top 6 7 of either a unit or a fridge freezer with various tablets inside. 8 And were they all seized? 9 10 Α. Yes. Okay. Where were the knives found? 11 Q. 12 Α. I don't know if I can refer to my notebook. I think 13 they were potentially the -- one of the drawers in the kitchen. 14 15 Q. All right. I'll see if I can help you with that. If we could perhaps go to paragraph 107, there's 16 17 mention here of the knives: "I can't remember what the knife from the incident 18 looks like now." 19 20 Is that a reference to the knife from Hayfield Road? 21 Α. Yes. "I think I must've seen the knife from the incident. 22 Q. A photograph must've been shown at the briefing because 23 the knives at [Collette Bell's address] were visually 24 similar to the knife at Hayfield Road. I've not put 25

1 that in my notebook but I wrote the statement days after the fact so [it's] clear in my memory." 2 3 That perhaps doesn't assist us with precisely where the knives were recovered from. 4 5 It may not be important, but --I'm certain it was a kitchen drawer, but in terms of 6 Α. 7 which actual drawer, I can't be certain. But your recollection is that the knives were within 8 Q. 9 a drawer? 10 Α. Yes. Do you recall whether the drawer was open or closed? 11 Q. 12 Α. I think it was closed. This of course will all be 13 photographed by the -- by the SOCO. Of course. Don't worry --14 Q. 15 Sorry, I don't see anything. Sorry. Α. No, don't worry, we can move on from that. 16 Q. 17 So on 4 May of 2015, you were the crime scene manager both for Martyn Dick's address and for 18 19 Arran Crescent. 20 One final question: you have given evidence that 21 when you made your way to Martyn Dick's address there 22 wasn't a scene entry log up and running, and that was the first thing you instructed to happen. 23 24 Α. Yes.

Q. Was there a scene entry log set up when you arrived at

25

Collette Bell's address? 1 A. I think there must have been, because otherwise I'd have 2 3 taken the same action and made the same comment in my notebook and statement. So I think there must have 4 5 been, and from memory there was. Q. All right. 6 7 So you've explained the tasks that you carried out on 4 May of 2015. Did you have any ongoing involvement 8 in this inquiry beyond 4 May? 9 10 A. Very briefly. So I think the next day we were instructed that -- take no further part in the inquiry 11 12 and to hand over all productions. There wasn't much in 13 the way of explanations as to why that was. I had 14 a brief involvement on this, I think it must have been 15 6 May, the Wednesday, I was asked to do a visual examination of a vehicle that had been seized. 16 All right. I don't think I need to ask you any more 17 Q. 18 questions about that today. 19 Before we conclude, can I ask you some questions 20 about training? 21 Α. Yeah. We've touched on training already and you told us about 22 Q. the crime scene managers course that you did in the 23 February of 2015. 24 Can we go back to paragraph 20 of your statement, 25

1 please. If I can take you back to your probationer time 2 at Tulliallan, and you've explained: 3 "Week 1 attending police college as a new constable 4 probationer, the entire first week was dedicated to 5 diversity." 6 You go on to say: 7 "I can't remember anything specifically from it. I don't recall any other training on diversity and 8 9 equalities." 10 Do you remember anything at all about that training? I think that's quite badly worded. I think it's the 11 Α. 12 detail of it I don't recall, but I remember the nature 13 of the training in terms of being aware of diversity and 14 how to approach various issues as a police officer. So 15 it's just the exact detail I don't recall. 16 Okay. Do you recall what the topics were that were Q. covered over that week-long course? 17 18 Α. Yeah, from memory it was broken down to race, religion, 19 gender, and suchlike. 20 Okay. And you say you don't recall any training on Q. 21 diversify and equality since? No, although since providing that statement there has 22 Α. been an online training package released. 23

Okay. Tell us about the online training package.

I haven't had the opportunity to complete that yet.

24

25

Q.

Α.

103

1 Q. Okay. 2 I only became aware of it last week, and we had quite Α. 3 a busy week at work last week. 4 Q. Okay. 5 Now, you told us that you'd joined the police in 2007; you had a week of diversity. That would have been 6 7 in 2007 when you were a probationer; we're now in 2023. Has there been no other equalities and diversity 8 training in the intervening years? 9 Not that I recall. 10 Α. Do you recall whether your training back in 2007 covered 11 Q. 12 unconscious bias? 13 I don't recall that it did, no. Α. 14 You do however say in your statement at paragraph 141, Q. 15 if we might go there, please, you say: "In my opinion I don't believe I hold any biased 16 17 thoughts, I try every day to deal with every person with professionalism and impartiality. I'm conscious of 18 unconscious bias being a factor but I don't let it 19 20 affect how I operate." 21 Can you help us to understand how you guard against 22 unconscious bias playing any part in how you deal with members of the public? 23 A. Yeah, the very nature of unconscious bias, you're not 24 necessarily conscious of it, but as I've said there 25

1 I try every day to treat people with compassion and impartiality and be professional, treat people the way 2 3 I would expect myself or my friends or my family to be 4 treated, and that's the approach I take every day. 5 You say at paragraph 142: Q. "I have been asked if, looking back now, did 6 7 Sheku Bayoh's race play any part in my involvement in the enquiry. For me personally no, absolutely not, 8 I acted with professionalism and impartiality. I have 9 10 a huge amount of empathy for Sheku Bayoh's family given the family dynamic. It was harrowing when I went to 11 12 Mr Bayoh's address and seeing the setup and being able 13 to relate to that and seeing the child who has lost the father. Honestly, I personally acted with fairness and 14 15 race didn't play a part." 16 And you maintain that view today? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. You go on at paragraph 144, please, to say: 19 "I've never seen any examples of discrimination by 20 police in Kirkcaldy in relation to race. I'm not aware 21 of any other police officers having racist views. I've 22 not heard any racist jokes or comments from any police officers. To elaborate, that's something I've actively 23 challenged and would be disgusted by ... I can honestly 24 25 say that I've never encountered that."

1 Α. Yeah. 2 Does that remain your position --Q. 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. -- today? 5 Can I ask you, detective constable, whether any of your decisions or your actions on 4 May of 2015 were 6 7 influenced to any degree by Martyn Dick's connection to Sheku Bayoh? 8 9 Α. No. 10 Q. Or by Collette Bell's connection to Sheku Bayoh? 11 Α. No. 12 Q. And were any of your decisions or actions on that day 13 influenced to any degree by the fact that Mr Bayoh had 14 died following contact with the police? 15 Α. I'm led by the SIO, that that's the decision-maker effectively, but no. 16 Thank you. Can you give me a moment, please? 17 Q. 18 Α. Yeah. 19 (Pause) 20 Just one final question. You explained that your Q. 21 involvement came to an end on 5 or 6 May or thereabouts, 22 that you came off the inquiry, you were asked to hand over productions. What was your understanding as to why 23 24 you'd been taken off the inquiry? So it wasn't me personally, it was the whole inquiry 25 Α.

```
1
             team that were instructed to take no further part in
 2
             the inquiry. It was all a bit mysterious at the time,
 3
             if I'm honest, there was no explanation given and there
 4
             was no further instruction than that. So I don't know,
 5
             it wasn't elaborated upon.
         MS THOMSON: Thank you, I've no further questions.
 6
 7
         THE WITNESS: Thank you.
         LORD BRACADALE: Are there any Rule 9 applications?
 8
 9
             Ms Mitchell.
10
                 Detective constable, I wonder whether you would
             withdraw to the witness room while I hear
11
12
             an application.
         THE WITNESS: Of course.
13
14
                       (In the absence of the witness)
15
         LORD BRACADALE: Yes, Ms Mitchell.
         MS MITCHELL: Yes, my Lord, briefly. The witness understood
16
17
             that he was there lawfully and that they were carrying
             out a visual inspection, but also including --
18
         LORD BRACADALE: This is at Dick's house?
19
20
         MS MITCHELL: This is at Dick's house, including opening
21
             drawers, et cetera.
                 The questions that I would like to put to the
22
             witness was: what was his understanding of the purpose
23
             of seeking a search warrant? To ask him why he didn't
24
             seize the drugs or the herbal matter and the grinder at
25
```

1	the time that he saw them? And whether or not he told
2	Dev Kapadia that he was already in the house and had
3	seen said items at the time of requesting a warrant?
4	LORD BRACADALE: So when you say what was his understanding
5	of the purpose of seeking a search warrant, what do you
6	mean by that?
7	MS MITCHELL: Indeed. Against the background that he was
8	already he says he was already there lawfully and he
9	was already carrying out a visual inspection and, it
10	would appear, a physical search.
11	LORD BRACADALE: I see. I understand now. You're referring
12	to the decision to contact the fiscal.
13	MS MITCHELL: Indeed.
14	LORD BRACADALE: Right.
15	MS MITCHELL: So I appreciate it wasn't his decision, but
16	I'm wanting to explore: what was his understanding of
17	why he was doing that?
18	LORD BRACADALE: Well, it seems to me that each of these
19	items has been the subject of evidence, and I don't
20	think it would assist me further by exploring any of
21	these points further. So I won't allow an examination.
22	So if you just return to your seat for a moment.
23	Give me a moment while I consult with my assessor.
24	(Pause)
25	Could we have the witness back, please.

1	(In the presence of the witness)
2	Questions from THE CHAIR
3	LORD BRACADALE: Detective constable, can you help me with
4	one matter.
5	You gave evidence that there had been a briefing
6	that you attended and in your book you had noted
7	"Warrant?" and then you were told that the house was
8	seized with consent, and that was the person giving you
9	the briefing that made reference to consent; is that
10	correct?
11	A. Yes.
12	LORD BRACADALE: And who was that person?
13	A. It would either have been DCI Keith Hardie or there was
14	a crime scene co-ordinator allocated, who was
15	DCI Houston. I think it was DCI Hardie.
16	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you.
17	Now, thank you very much, detective constable, for
18	coming to give evidence to the Inquiry.
19	I think that's all the evidence today, is that
20	right, Ms Grahame?
21	MS GRAHAME: That's correct, we've completed all of our
22	evidence.
23	LORD BRACADALE: Very well, I'll be adjourning in a moment,
24	and you'll be free to go.
25	(The witness withdrew)

```
LORD BRACADALE: So, adjourning now until tomorrow morning
 1
 2
            at 10 o'clock.
 3
        (12.57 pm)
                      (The hearing adjourned until 10 am
 4
 5
                       on Wednesday, 8 February 2023)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	I N D E X
2	
3	MR DEV KAPADIA (affirmed)1
4	
5	Questions from MS THOMSON1
6	
7	DC ROBERT FINCH (affirmed)52
8	
9	Questions from MS THOMSON52
10	
11	(In the absence of the witness)107
12	
13	(In the presence of the witness)108
14	
15	Questions from THE CHAIR108
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	