1		Thursday, 14 September 2023
2	(10	.00 am)
3		MR RUARAIDH NICOLSON (continued)
4		Questions from MS GRAHAME (continued)
5	LOR	D BRACADALE: Good morning. Ms Grahame, would you please
6		continue with the examination of Mr Nicolson.
7	MS	GRAHAME: Thank you very much.
8		Good morning, Mr Nicolson.
9	A.	Good morning.
L 0	Q.	Yesterday as we reached the end of the day's proceedings
11		we were talking about police securing properties and
12		I had asked you about as we looked at the minutes of
13		the Gold Group meetings, there were five loci identified
L 4		and I was asking questions primarily about the three
L5		properties where there were householders, so
L 6		Collette Bell's house, Martyn Dick's house, and the
L7		family home of Zahid Saeed.
L8		If I can begin by just simply summarising my
L9		understanding of the position. I think we as
20		I understood what you said, the SIO's role would be to
21		identify the properties that were to be secured and to
22		consider what justification there was for securing those
23		properties and you're nodding which is good.
24	Α.	Yes.
25	\circ	And then we heard that there was a crime scene

- 1 coordinator appointed --
- 2 A. Yes.
- ${\tt Q.}$ -- and there were crime scene managers and I think you
- 4 said that one or other of them would be responsible for
- 5 delivering an explanation to the police officers, who
- 6 would then go out and secure the properties.
- 7 A. That's correct.
- 8 Q. And the explanation would be essentially why the
- 9 property was being identified and was to be secured,
- 10 what they were looking for, and to answer questions such
- as when the occupiers would get the property back. That
- 12 type of thing.
- 13 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 14 Q. And then the officers on the ground would go out to the
- properties and deal with the occupants and they would
- know if there was a warrant, they would have been told
- about that, and if there wasn't a warrant those officers
- 18 would be responsible for seeking consent from the
- 19 occupiers.
- 20 A. That's correct.
- Q. And they would have some discretion to provide
- 22 information and deal with the occupants as they saw fit.
- 23 A. That's correct, yes.
- 24 Q. Is that a reasonable summary of where we were?
- 25 A. Yes, absolutely, yes.

- 1 Q. Thank you. And as the proceedings drew to a close
 2 I started to ask you questions about if there were
 3 conflicts or issues that arose, were those brought to
 4 the Gold Group's attention.
- 5 A. Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 6 Q. And I think you said:
- "Answer: It depends what the conflict is and what

 it's about. The Gold is more focused on the strategy

 and making sure that we deliver on that strategy and, as

 I said, we stabilise and make sure that we don't lose

 anything~..."
- 12 A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And I'm interested in exploring what you meant when you said "make sure we don't lose anything", just so that people can understand what you mean. We talked yesterday about -- you talked about productions and you talked about evidence and so when you say "not lose anything", what was it you actually meant by that?
 - A. Well, we would need to secure productions, as I said already, so it would depend on exactly what the SIO is looking for in terms of the house searches, so, you know, an opportunity -- and I'm not suggesting that's what's happening here, but an opportunity to destroy evidence. You know, if there's a drugs search, flush drugs down the toilet, all of that kind of thing,

- 1 so it's just in all of these cases making sure that the evidence isn't lost. So from a police service 2 3 perspective in this kind of incident we're making sure 4 that we can provide everything possible to the PIRC so 5 that they can carry out their independent and effective enquiry. So productions that would be outside and if it 6 was raining or, you know, wind or whatever, then making 7 sure that these productions are preserved, if you can, 8 9 at the location that they're at, and if you believe that 10 you can't, then to seize them -- have them photographed 11 hopefully and then seize them and bring them back where 12 they're safe.
- Q. And when you use the word "productions" I'm right in saying that in a criminal trial items, as well as documents, can become either labels or productions, but they're pieces of evidence that the Crown will rely on to perhaps prosecute someone in the future at a trial?
 - A. That's correct, yes.
- Q. And you're talking about evidence being destroyed and that can be where it's lost. Could that also include things like clothing that is washed --
- 22 A. Yes.

- 23 Q. -- or burned or destroyed in some other way?
- A. Yes, absolutely.
- Q. So if there's any confusion with people who are

1 listening to your evidence, you weren't just simply talking about losing things, misplacing them --2 3 Α. No, no. 4 -- you were talking about them being lost to the Q. 5 prosecution at a later trial? A. Yes, that's what I was talking about, yes. 6 7 Q. Thank you. So effectively that means that that evidence would perhaps not be present at all at the future trial, 8 9 or it would be rendered inadmissible in some way, there 10 would be some flaw or some issue that caused it not to be available to the prosecution later? 11 12 A. Yes, that's correct. Thank you. We heard evidence from a DC Finch previously 13 Q. 14 in the Inquiry, on Day 38 in February of this year, and 15 he said -- I asked him about: "Question: In a situation where the police don't 16 have a search warrant or other lawful ground to carry 17 18 out a search, such as the householder's consent, what 19 would be the consequences if the police were to search 20 a property regardless and seize the evidence? 21 And his answer was: "Answer: The likelihood is that the search and 22 recovery of the evidence would be deemed inadmissible in 23 later court proceedings." 24 Does that sum up really what the problem is? 25

- 1 A. That's absolutely right, yes, so~...
- 2 Q. So the police need to have the authority or the
- 3 evidence, if they receive any -- obtain any evidence,
- 4 could become inadmissible later?
- 5 A. No, that's right and if they're searching for one thing,
- 6 for instance, and what happens quite regularly, they
- 7 search for drugs and they find a firearm, they would
- 8 need to then go and -- they would obviously hold it
- 9 there, but they would then go to extend the warrant and
- 10 they would go back to Crown Office in terms of the
- 11 firearm.
- 12 Q. And that could be highly significant to the prospects of
- any criminal trial in the future. You mentioned
- 14 an example of drugs, if the drugs weren't available it
- may make it very difficult for the Crown to prosecute
- someone?
- 17 A. There would probably be no case.
- 18 Q. Right. And we have heard other evidence that if consent
- is refused by an occupier and there's no warrant, you
- 20 have to get a warrant and the way of doing that, the
- 21 procedure is that an officer contacts a Procurator
- 22 Fiscal, speaks to the Fiscal and prepares an
- application.
- 24 A. That's right.
- Q. And they then put it in front of a Sheriff and the

- 1 Sheriff will consider granting the warrant.
- 2 A. That's correct.

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And then the police have the warrant and they can use that to go and search the property.
- 5 A. That's correct, yes.
- Q. Do you know or do you remember now what an officer would require to persuade the Fiscal to put an application before a Sheriff and ultimately persuade the Sheriff to grant a warrant?
- 10 Α. Well, so all the information about the incident they're investigating, what they are likely to find, you know, 11 12 that they believe it's there, any information or 13 intelligence that would suggest that it's there and the details of the house, the property and so it would need 14 15 to be persuasive evidence to convince the Fiscal in the first place and then to convince the Sheriff thereafter, 16 17 so as much detail as possible and outlining why it is 18 important in terms of the incident that's being dealt 19 with.
 - Q. And if I suggested that they would need to persuade the Fiscal and then the Sheriff there were reasonable grounds for suspecting a criminal offence had been committed and the evidence would be found at the place named in the warrant, does that sound like a reasonable description of what's required?

- 1 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 2 Q. Thank you. Is it possible for an officer to seek
- a retrospective warrant, so to carry out a search and
- 4 then think: oh, we had better get authority, I'm going
- 5 to go and ask the Fiscal now for a search I have already
- 6 carried out?
- 7 A. I'm not sure what kind of reception they might get in
- 8 terms of that, but, well, it would be entirely possible
- 9 and it might be a route of trying to mitigate the damage
- 10 that's been done, but I'm not sure it would be granted.
- 11 Q. Right. Do you think you would get that past the Fiscal?
- 12 A. I don't think so.
- Q. Have you ever come across a situation where that's been
- 14 attempted?
- 15 A. No, I can't think --
- 16 Q. Or succeeded?
- 17 A. I don't think it would have succeeded but it might have
- been attempted, but I suppose that someone realising
- 19 that they have made a mistake and then to try and
- 20 mitigate that mistake and, you know, put their hands up
- 21 to what's happened, well, you know, they could attempt
- or try, or try to persuade, but it seems unlikely that
- that would be successful.
- Q. Right. So not an approach that you would recommend, put
- it that way?

25

Q.

1 No, it would be better to get -- to apply for the warrant and then execute the warrant in the proper 2 3 format and the likelihood of success would be much 4 higher. 5 And the proper format is apply in advance before you do Q. 6 the search? 7 Α. Exactly. Q. Can I move on to some evidence we have heard about the 8 9 three properties, Collette Bell, Martyn Dick and 10 the home of Zahid Saeed. We heard from Garry McEwan in evidence, on 30 August, about this issue about authority 11 12 and he said: 13 "Answer: To go for a warrant you have to stipulate 14 on the warrant predominantly what it is you're going there for, what purpose. ... At that early stage ..." 15 So at the early stage in matters, 3 May we were 16 17 talking about: "Answer: ... I'm not sure that level of information 18 and detail would be known." 19 20 He then agreed that officers may not have been in 21 a position to secure a warrant because they wouldn't have all the details and they were very much dependent 22 on consent being given by householders. 23 24 Α. Yes.

From your recollection of events on 3 May 2015 does that

1		accord with your
2	Α.	Yes, I think that's right, yes.
3	Q.	So the police were very much dependent on consent?
4	Α.	They were.
5	Q.	We heard also from Pat Campbell in evidence about
6		Collette Bell's house and this was on Day 47, 9 March
7		this year, and I asked him if he personally had carried
8		out any checks in relation to the properties to ensure
9		that the correct authority was in place, whether
10		a consent or a warrant, and this is for Collette Bell's
11		house, and he said no, that he would be delegating
12		various responsibilities to individuals, he named
13		Stuart Houston and he said:
14		"Answer: I knew that what he would put in place
15		would be sufficient to basically account for the search
16		by consent and if there were any issues he would have
17		made me aware of them as such, so I wasn't particularly
18		aware and drilling down into~"
19		The detail effectively.
20		And he said, in relation to Stuart Houston:
21		"Answer: he would have deployed crime scene
22		managers to all the different locations, who would have
23		engaged with the householders around what we were
24		planning to do about the return of the property how long
25		it was likely to take and so on."

Τ		And he said:
2		"Answer: And if there was any feedback coming or
3		there were any issues with any of the consent that was
4		given or implied."
5		So he would expect feedback from Stuart Houston if
6		there were any issues about getting consent.
7		Does that description of Pat Campbell's role in
8		proceedings sound like a reasonable explanation?
9	A.	Yes, absolutely. So we train the crime scene
10		coordinator and the crime scene managers in terms of
11		their roles, so the expectation is that they would go
12		and get on with what they're trained to do, so
13	Q.	And so it's reasonable for the SIO to delegate
14		responsibility
15	A.	It is.
16	Q.	and assume that that will be carried out properly?
17	A.	Yes, absolutely. You know, like as I said in terms
18		of the strategic role, my strategic role, I can't look
19		at every aspect of what's going on, there's too much to
20		be done in terms of that, and it will be the same in his
21		role, he has a wide role with a number of different
22		issues ongoing, so it would be very difficult for him to
23		dip down and check that absolutely everything is in
24		place. At some stage he will learn, I have no doubt,
25		get feedback in terms of what happened and but at

1 that stage it is reasonable to think that he delegates down and that the crime scene coordinator and the crime 2 scene managers get on with their job and their work. 3 4 Q. And the feedback could be: we can't get consent, we will 5 need to get a warrant --That's correct. 6 Α. 7 Q. -- and there will need to be an application made, and that can be discussed at that point? 8 That's correct, yes. 9 Α. 10 Q. And I think yesterday you said in that situation 11 the police would remain at the property and then try and 12 secure the warrant? 13 That's correct, yes. Α. And then we also heard from Pat Campbell about 14 Q. 15 Martyn Dick's house and we heard evidence from him where he said: 16 17 "Answer: There was no indication from any of the householders that there was any conflict with consent to 18 19 search the properties. There was nothing to indicate 20 they weren't consenting~..." 21 And I asked him if he was satisfied that the officers had obtained consent for a search of 22 Martyn Dick's house when Martyn Dick and his partner 23 were removed from the house, and he said "Yes". He 24 said -- he mentioned the forensic strategy meeting, the 25

1 officers who dealt with Martyn Dick were not present at that forensic strategy meeting but the information is 2 3 coming second-hand and that was from Colin Robson and 4 Stuart Houston: "Answer: ... and they are feeding into the forensic 5 strategy meeting which I'm chairing so the information 6 7 I'm getting is that consent has been agreed for all the properties to search." 8 9 Again, is it reasonable for someone in 10 Pat Campbell's situation as SIO to rely on the feedback coming to him through Stuart Houston, the crime scene 11 12 coordinator, and perhaps DI Robson? 13 Yes, absolutely, that's how he should get the feedback. Α. 14 And would that be the normal sort of procedure that's Q. 15 adopted in these situations? 16 It would be, yes. Α. And then again finally we heard from Pat Campbell on the 17 Q. securing of Zahid Saeed's family home. This was on 18 10 March and he again said that he understood that that 19 20 house was seized on the basis of consent and it was 21 consent that gave him the authority to have the search 22 carried out on the property. 23 A. Yes. Q. So again it appears in relation to all of those 24 25 properties that consent was the basis?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And did you hear anything to suggest that that wasn't
- 3 the position in the Gold Group?
- 4 A. No, not that I recall.
- 5 Q. We haven't heard from Stuart Houston but we do have
- a signed Inquiry statement from Stuart Houston, the
- 7 crime scene coordinator. He says he arrived in
- 8 Kirkcaldy after midday and there was a briefing at about
- 9 12.30 that day and then he speaks about attending --
- speaking to SPA Forensic Services at about 1.30 and then
- 11 having the forensic strategy meeting after 4.00. So he
- 12 wasn't at Kirkcaldy first thing in the morning, he came
- in the afternoon.
- 14 He has given the Inquiry statement in relation to
- 15 Martyn Dick and Collette Bell's house. I wonder if we
- can have his Inquiry statement on the screen because
- I would like to refer you to some of his evidence.
- SBPI00214. You will see this is a statement taken from
- 19 DCI Stuart Houston last year and if we go down to
- 20 paragraph 249 and I will deal with a few of -- what
- I will do is I will go through these paragraphs with you
- and then I will ask you some questions at the end.
- 23 A. Yes, no problem.
- 24 Q. If we start with 249, so this is Stuart Houston, crime
- 25 scene coordinator:

"My understanding of this address ..." 1 This is a passage in his Inquiry statement that 2 relates to Martyn Dick and also Collette Bell's house: 3 4 "My understanding of this address ... is that the 5 deceased was at these addresses so it's about preserving them. The legal basis is that they are scenes that may 6 7 be linked to his death. As far as I was aware there were no warrants at the location. But you'd protect the 8 9 loci in order to get warrants further down the line. We're within our rights to do this." 10 And if we carry on: 11 12 "You would need to ask people to move. It's quite 13 common that we do as police. You don't know what's 14 there until you search it. The deceased had been there 15 prior to his death, that's the reason for searching. I'm not sure if the occupiers were asked to move, that 16 17 was done before my involvement. I was made aware that police officers were present at each location." 18 19 Then 251: 20 "The fact is, we're not going to get to them on 21 3 May. My thought process was, as long as they're 22 preserved, I don't need to go there at this time. I'm making a guess, but I think they were secured by 23 uniformed police, so you can seize anything that's 24 relevant to an investigation. To be blunt, because 25

1	they're protected by police, I maybe didn't give those
2	loci the attention they needed at that time. That's
3	prioritisation in doing the things that need to get
4	done."
5	And then at 252:
6	"I can't speak to what happened before I was there.
7	My interpretation is if you've got something that might
8	be subject to an investigation, you'd tell them and ask
9	them to leave and examine it as a consensual crime
10	scene"
11	So I think he is referencing consent there:
12	" or take a warrant. That would be from the
13	people who were there. I know the [redacted] one,
14	something happened at that address, the [redacted] one
15	I'm not too sure about."
16	We have redactions on the screen because the
17	individual addresses are actually redacted because of
18	data protection but I'm telling you they are Martyn Dick
19	and Collette Bell's houses. So this is what he is
20	referring to at that time and when we look back at
21	paragraph 250 and he says:
22	"I'm not sure if the occupiers were asked to move,
23	that was done before my involvement."
24	You will see that on the screen now. He did not
25	as I said earlier, he did not arrive until the

1	afternoon, so although he was appointed as crime scene
2	coordinator it wasn't until later on that day.
3	Then 254 please. He says:
4	"My understanding is the searches were done long
5	after I was done. I've no detail of anybody searching
6	those houses in the time I was involved. I don't know
7	what was found in the searches."
8	So again he has come in the afternoon, appointed as
9	coordinator, but he was not aware of searches being done
10	until long after he has left Kirkcaldy, so that seems to
11	be the sum total of his involvement as coordinator.
12	Then can I ask you to look at paragraph 258. And
13	this you will see at the top it says it is
14	Zahid Saeed's address, that's the family home for
15	Zahid Saeed. He says:
16	" you're not needing the whole house as such.
17	It's not the whole house that needs to be secured. It's
18	focused to what's relevant. You're only going to get
19	the clothing and the car and that was it. I don't think
20	the house was seized as a locus. I don't think that
21	house was ever actually secured for any period of time.
22	That was my understanding of what was going to happen.
23	Officers took possession of the vehicle."
24	So in Stuart Houston's recollection the only objects
25	they were really interested in, in relation to the

1 family home of Zahid Saeed, was clothing and the car. So he doesn't seem to think the whole house needed to be 2 3 secured. 4 Then finally, 266: 5 "I have been told the occupiers' position is that no permission was given for the police to secure the 6 7 property and that a complaint was made." Again, this follows on in relation to the home of 8 Zahid Saeed's family: 9 10 "I wasn't aware of this. I would dispute that they said they didn't give permission. If we didn't have 11 12 permission then we'd stay there until we had a warrant." 13 So he seems to be of the same view as you that if 14 there's no permission you have to seek a warrant and the 15 police remain there until that's obtained? 16 I agree, yes. Α. But as crime scene coordinator he doesn't seem to 17 Q. 18 understand -- or have been told that no permission was 19 given to secure Zahid Saeed's property and that consent 20 wasn't given. Now, reading that, does that concern you? 21 Α. Yes, it does. 22 And why does that concern you? Q. Well, there's obviously a different view on whether 23 Α. permission was given or not, according to Stuart's 24 25 statement, so we should be quite clear that we've got

1 consent and if we don't have consent then we ought to get a warrant and there seems to be confusion in terms 2 3 of what Stuart's understanding is of what was going on, 4 but --5 And -- sorry. Q. A. Yes, but I suppose my question is what was he actually 6 7 coordinating at that stage because it seems to be that he has arrived and he says, I think, if I understood it 8 correctly, that the searches were carried out long after 9 10 he was gone, so he obviously wasn't coordinating the searches. 11 12 Q. And if we go back to Collette Bell and Martyn Dick's 13 houses -- I read those paragraphs to you earlier, that 14 was from 249 down to 252. At 250 he says he isn't sure 15 if the occupiers were asked to move: "That was done before my involvement." 16 17 So it would appear that if consent was obtained from Collette Bell or Martyn Dick, this was before the 18 19 coordinator was actually involved? That's entirely possible. 20 Α. 21 Q. What do you think about that then? Who was coordinating 22 and managing things if Stuart Houston wasn't in Kirkcaldy at the time? 23 A. Well, the crime scene managers were obviously -- well, 24

the truth is I don't know. We've got Stuart's

1 statement, but, you know, we would need some more detail roundabout that, but the crime scene managers 2 3 themselves -- again, I don't know when they were 4 deployed, so these are questions that Pat Campbell and 5 his deputy could, or ought to be able to answer in terms of the whole coordination of exactly what's gone on and 6 7 how the enquiry was progressing, when the crime scene managers were available, when the crime scene 8 9 coordinator -- what was the expectation of the crime 10 scene coordinator when he arrived and before he left. 11 Q. So we heard earlier that Pat Campbell was delegating 12 things --13 Α. Yes. -- and leaving the detail of getting consent or 14 Q. 15 a warrant to the crime scene coordinator. If the crime scene coordinator didn't arrive until after the 16 17 properties had been seized, what would you have -- what 18 would you consider that his ongoing responsibilities were in relation to the coordination of the crime 19 20 scenes? 21 Yes, well, so just exactly that, it is coordinating the Α. 22 five scenes. If the consent has already been -- or they have already got consent in terms of the searches, the 23 seizure of the properties, then he would be there to 24 collate all the information, to understand what was 25

- being seized, to ensure that it was seized in a proper
 fashion and then it was brought to wherever they were
 going to bring all the property to, to record -- to
 record when it was seized, what it was, and production
 management. So that would be my expectation of a crime
 scene coordinator.

 Q. So when Pat Campbell takes the decision to appoint
 a crime scene coordinator, what should he continue to
 - Q. So when Pat Campbell takes the decision to appoint a crime scene coordinator, what should he continue to do; is there supposed to be a handover with the crime scene coordinator, or some sort of briefing that --
- 11 A. Yes, so the crime scene coordinator ought to be briefed
 12 so that he understands exactly what's going on, why the
 13 houses are being searched and what the expectation is of
 14 him and his role, so he would either get briefed by
 15 Pat Campbell or Pat Campbell's -- more likely
 16 Pat Campbell's deputy, so that he could undertake the
 17 work that is expected of him.
- Q. And is it at that briefing that he should be given

 a full explanation of whether the house has been seized,

 whether a search has commenced --
- 21 A. Yes.

9

- 22 Q. -- what the authority was for --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. -- doing that?
- 25 A. Yes, so -- yes.

1	Q.	Is he given the explanation about the full
2		justification?
3	A.	Well, he should be, he should be. If he is going to
4		undertake his role in a proper fashion then he's got to
5		know and understand all the detail, he's got to know and
6		understand exactly what's expected of him, he's got to
7		know and understand what's actually happening at each of
8		the loci, so but that would have to come from
9		a briefing. Now, that might be face-to-face or it might
10		be by phone or but he would have to be properly
11		briefed before he could undertake his role.
12	Q.	Can I ask you what you make of the comment in
13		paragraph 251:
14		" I think they were secured by uniformed
15		police"
16		We're still on Collette Bell and Martyn Dick's
17		house:
18		" so you can seize anything that's relevant to an
19		investigation. To be blunt, because they're protected
20		by police, I maybe didn't give those loci the attention
21		they needed at that time."
22		What do you make of that comment?
23	A.	I'm not sure. You would have to ask Stuart Houston, but
24		he obviously had questions in his mind but he is saying
25		that he didn't give it the attention that it needed or

1 he says he maybe didn't give it the attention that it 2 needed at that time, but I can't speculate on exactly 3 what he means by that. 4 Q. No. Can we look again at paragraph 252: 5 "I can't speak to what happened before I was there." Is that the sort of comment you would expect 6 7 somebody who was properly briefed to be making? Well, it depends what he means by that comment, so does 8 Α. 9 he mean that, you know, he can't give evidence about 10 what happened, or what people did, you know, there is somebody else to give evidence in terms of what he did. 11 12 But, you know, was he given a briefing, did he 13 understand what had unfolded prior to him arriving 14 there? But so -- I don't know what that comment means. 15 It could mean a lot of things. 16 Q. He says: 17 "My interpretation is if you've got something that 18 might be subject to an investigation, you'd tell them 19 and ask them to leave and examine it as a consensual 20 crime scene~..." 21 What about that description of obtaining consent to 22 tell people, ask them to leave and examine a crime 23 scene? 24 Α. Well, so it's pretty clumsy, but I assume what he is suggesting and what he is saying is that a consensual 25

- 1 crime scene, that it would be with consent that you
- 2 would carry out that examination.
- 3 Q. Right. I would like to ask you about crime scene
- 4 managers. Was this something that was discussed at the
- 5 Gold Group meeting at all?
- 6 A. I don't recollect that and I don't think it would be, in
- 7 any detail anyway.
- 8 Q. Right. I mean, Houston -- we saw yesterday Houston was
- 9 named as a coordinator?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Is that really the sort of level that you would get
- information about in the Gold Group?
- 13 A. Yes, mostly.
- 14 Q. Again, from the statement from DCI Houston we know that
- he didn't go to the loci himself.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. He would expect feedback from the crime scene managers.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And I think that accords with what you have told us?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. He said that the crime scene managers were all DCs,
- 22 detective constables, and we have been, in the Inquiry,
- 23 trying to see who exactly was the crime scene manager
- for each location. So if we start with Collette Bell's
- 25 house we have looked at the scene entry log and it

- 1 appears that it was a DC Stamford who is listed as
- 2 assisting the crime scene manager, but there's no crime
- 3 scene manager named in the paperwork in the crime scene
- 4 log.
- 5 A. Right.
- 6 Q. I should say DCI Houston doesn't name any of the crime
- 7 scene managers in his statement, so he doesn't name them
- in his statement and we have looked at the scene entry
- 9 log for Collette Bell's house and although we can find
- 10 the name DC Stamford, there isn't a crime scene manager
- 11 named. Would you expect the crime scene manager to be
- named in a scene entry log?
- 13 A. Well, it depends whether the crime scene manager went
- into the scene or not and I don't know whether they did
- or not, but it sounds like if they're not on the scene
- 16 entry log then they didn't, but -- so if they're
- managing, you know, what's happening they could manage
- that externally from the scene itself, depending on what
- 19 the scene is.
- 20 Q. So it can be managed remotely by the crime scene
- 21 manager --
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. -- not actually being present?
- 24 A. Not being in -- within the location.
- 25 Q. We have also looked at Houston's daybook and we can't

- 1 see any names of a crime scene manager for Collette Bell's house. Is there anywhere else that you 2 3 could suggest to us that we might be able to find 4 paperwork that lists the name of the crime scene 5 manager? There should be statements from the crime scene 6 Α. 7 managers, I would have thought. And in relation to Martyn Dick's house, again we have 8 Q. 9 looked at the crime -- the scene entry log and DC Finch 10 who I mentioned his evidence previously, he was named as 11 locus protection but he did sign as crime scene manager 12 in that section, so do you think -- and Houston said 13 crime scene managers were DCs, so do you think it was 14 probably DC Finch that was the crime scene manager? 15 Well, it sounds like it might be, but I honestly don't Α. know. I just wouldn't know that level of detail. 16
- Q. All right. And again, just for completion, in the
 family home of Zahid Saeed DC Finch was also there for
 locus protection but I think did sign as the crime scene
 manager, so he may have been the crime scene manager for
 both of those properties.
- Is that sort of paper trail what you would expect -given the significance of consent --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- to the seizing, securing, searching of these three

22

23

24

25

Q.

1 properties, is that the sort of paperwork that you would 2 expect to be available in relation to who the crime 3 scene managers were and whether consent was obtained 4 from the householders? 5 I would certainly expect there to be paperwork that Α. would demonstrate who the crime scene managers were and 6 7 it should be straightforward to find out who they are. We should know who was on duty on that day and from that 8 9 understand who the crime scene managers were. I'm 10 afraid I'm retired seven years so I have no access to any systems but there are probably police officers in 11 12 this room that could help that, but ~... So there ought 13 to be paperwork that demonstrates quite clearly what 14 role each person had. 15 Q. We will keep looking. Sorry about that. 16 Α. So the Gold Group were not aware of the details? 17 Q. 18 Α. No, not at all. 19 Pat Campbell, it would appear from his evidence, Q. 20 delegated and didn't know about the details. 21 Α. Yes.

Stuart Houston, it would appear, didn't really know

happened before he arrived. There doesn't seem to be

about the details in relation to consent and what

this clear paper trail.

1 Do you have concerns about the basis on which 2 the police secured and seized properties that day, and 3 I'm thinking primarily about Collette Bell, Martyn Dick 4 and the home of Zahid Saeed? 5 Well, retrospectively you would want to know that it had Α. been carried out in the appropriate fashion, so either 6 7 that consent was obtained or that there was a warrant and we know that there weren't any warrants, so 8 9 presumably everybody that's involved in the searches 10 believed that they were carrying that out on a consensual -- on a consensual basis. How they got 11 12 that consent, I don't know, and we heard yesterday 13 about -- whether it was best practice -- one of the 14 officers said that he noted it in his notebook, and of 15 course that would be best practice, but that wouldn't happen on every occasion. But as long as there is 16 17 consent, that the person has been spoken to and both parties understand that there has been consent, then 18 19 from my perspective that's absolutely fine, it will be 20 for the officer to support that in terms of any evidence 21 that's given. 22 So in light of everything we have discussed today, where Q. does responsibility lie ultimately for ensuring that 23 consent was obtained for Collette Bell's house, 24

Martyn Dick's house and the family home of Zahid Saeed

to be secured, seized, entered and searched?

A. So -- well, so initially the responsibility would be with the people who went to search the property and for them to get consent for what it is that they're actually trying to achieve, you know, and as -- well, in the main the understanding will be that that's exactly what's been done. If that's not what's been done then fairly obviously there would need to be an intervention into that, but as I understand the evidence that's been given everybody believes -- and obviously, you know,

Stuart Houston is still to give evidence, but it looks like at paragraph 252 that he believes that it is on a consensual basis that the scenes are being examined,

Q. We have -- I will come on to this, but where we have heard evidence that consent was not given by certain occupiers but all the police officers believe consent is the basis on which they're proceeding, in a situation where there can be miscommunication, the extent to which that may or may not be the position here is a matter for the Chair, but if there is a situation which arises where there's misunderstanding or miscommunication between the occupiers and the police can you help the Chair identify how this could be avoided in the future?

What could be done to improve the situation and to avoid

25

1		these misunderstandings or miscommunication?
2	Α.	Well, we could insist on officers recording in notebooks
3		that consent has been given and there could be feedback,
4		or, you know, we could insist that there's feedback from
5		the officers on the ground to the crime scene manager,
6		through to the crime scene coordinator, we could insist
7		that it's recorded that there is consent been given for
8		each property.
9	Q.	So have that sort of direct feedback to the next in
10		line?
11	Α.	Yes, a formal system to record that consent has actually
12		been given.
13	Q.	Thank you. In relation to let's start with the
14		evidence from Collette Bell that we heard in relation to
15		her house. I'm going to give you a summary of what she
16		said and ask you to comment on it. This was given on
17		9 February of this year, on Day 40 of the hearing, and
18		I asked her if she understood that the police were going
19		to seize her house and she said no, but she said:
20		"Answer: I think it was just said to us that it was
21		the beginning of a crime scene~"
22		And I asked if she understood her house would be
23		searched and she said no, and I asked if she was given
24		an explanation that the house would be searched and she

said she didn't think so and she didn't -- I asked her

1 if she was asked for permission or consent and she said 2 no, but she did say: 3 "Answer: ... 'This looks like the beginning of 4 a crime scene~..." 5 That's what she was told: "Answer: ... and we will need to take hold of the 6 7 house so you will need to pack a bag'." That description as it has been given by 8 Collette Bell, does that match your expectations in 9 10 terms of how you obtain consent from someone? No, it doesn't. 11 Α. 12 Why not? Q. 13 Well, it doesn't sound like it is consensual, you know, Α. 14 so they would have to be pretty clear in terms of what's 15 understood by the consent being given, so the person would have to be told that that's what the intention 16 17 was, why that was and then ask for consent to be given 18 for -- and explain why that's important, but -- and then 19 obtain that consent. Q. And a suggestion we had heard previously and we 20 21 discussed yesterday, letting people know that they can 22 withdraw consent, would that be part of the process of obtaining consent? 23 A. Well, that isn't something that I have considered, but 24 of course, you know, you could include that in future 25

1 guidance to make sure that people knew and understood that they could withdraw that consent. 2 Thank you. And then in relation to evidence we have 3 Q. 4 heard regarding Martyn Dick's house, we heard this from 5 DC Finch, and I asked whether he understood that the

householders had consented not only to the seizure of 6 7

their house, or securing their house, but for it to be

searched for evidence relevant to the investigation into

Mr Bayoh's death and he said yes, that was his

10 understanding.

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, we have heard evidence that as part of a search that was carried out at Martyn Dick's house that herbal material was discovered and that DC Finch gave evidence that he phoned a DS Moore or a DI Wilson and he was advised to phone the on call Fiscal to seek a drugs search warrant and I asked him about this when he was giving evidence and he said:

"Answer: I can't recall why we needed the search warrant in addition to the consent."

So he thought he had consent to search the property but when he phoned up, having found -- or someone else had found the herbal material, he was advised to get a warrant. Can you explain why that would be done if there is consent?

A. Well, so the consent wouldn't be to search for drugs, so

- 1 the consent was to search in terms of the incident 2 that's being dealt with at the time, so if they go in 3 and they find something that's unrelated to what they 4 have already got consent for, so the sensible approach 5 is that you approach the Fiscal, you explain the detail and the Fiscal will either agree to present the detail 6 7 to a Sheriff and ask for a warrant for the property to seize the herbal material. 8
 - Q. And in these particular circumstances he had sought advice from a senior officer.
- 11 A. Yes.

9

10

- Q. He wasn't sure exactly who it was but it was a more senior in rank officer than him. Is that the type of behaviour you would expect from a DC on the ground?
 - A. No, that's exactly what you would expect.
- And then looking at other evidence we have heard, 16 Q. evidence from a PC Fraser, and this relates to the 17 family home of Zahid Saeed, he gave this on Day 62, 18 28 August, and he told us that he had attended with 19 20 a PC Aitken as locus protection on Zahid Saeed's family 21 home and he was the one that had maintained the scene 22 entry log. And I asked him to explain how he went about obtaining consent and he said: 23
- 24 "Answer: Yes, I would knock on the door, and introduce myself and if I was allowed entry, then

1	I would go in."
2	And:
3	"Answer: I would just ask questions, speak to
4	them and ask them what who are you and can you give
5	me your name, address, date of birth, that sort of
6	thing."
7	And he would talk to them. I asked him about
8	obtaining consent and he said that he it would all be
9	verbal, as he called it, and he would not necessarily
10	have written anything down in his notebook and he didn't
11	on this occasion write anything down in his notebook, he
12	didn't get any signatures.
13	So I asked him about where there was no written
14	consent did he think there was some other consent. He
15	said:
16	"Answer: I believe I must have been afforded entry
17	into the house. I didn't note any of the details of the
18	people but in order to speak to the people within, I can
19	only assume I don't recall but I can only assume
20	I knocked on the door and the door was opened."
21	And I asked him if he considered the opening of
22	a door was sufficient to be a recognition of consent and
23	he said:
24	"Answer: No, the person must they can numerous
25	ways, they can verbally say it or they can just motion

1		or wark away, reave the door open
2		And I said:
3		"Question: An open invitation, if you like?"
4		And he said:
5		"Answer: Yes.
6		And I asked if on that day anyone had given him
7		consent to go into the house and he said?
8		"Answer: I don't remember."
9		And then he had asked for support and CID came and
LO		that was the second occasion he went into the house and
11		I said: do you remember if anyone gave you consent at
12		that time, on the second occasion? And he said:
13		"Answer: No, I don't remember."
L 4		So from that description do you think that's
L5		sufficient to assume that the householder is giving
L 6		consent to seize the property, secure the property and
L7		search the property?
L8	Α.	No. As I said already, you would need to explain
L 9		exactly what it was that you were wanting to do and ask
20		the occupier for consent.
21	Q.	Right, thank you. I would like to move on to other
22		evidence we have. This is from a witness who has given
23		us a signed statement, Inquiry statement. His name is
24		Miller. We have not heard any oral evidence from him at
25		this stage, but this comes from his statement. He was

one of the CID officers who came to assist PC Fraser: 1 "We chapped the door and I can't remember if it was 2 3 Mrs Rashid or there was an officer that initially let us 4 in from the inside but we were invited in and Mrs Rashid 5 spoke to us." 6 She is one of the occupiers: 7 "Immediately she started asking us questions, what was going on, all the rest of it. We tried to explain 8 9 what was happening and the need to take it, take the 10 property. She was wondering why we were allowed in without a warrant so we tried to explain that to her, 11 12 that yes sometimes you do need warrants but on this 13 occasion, because it was a serious incident that 14 happened at that time, the property had been seized as 15 we've got to protect the forensic integrity of it." Now, this -- his recollection appears to be that 16 Mrs Rashid, the occupier, was asking for a warrant. 17 18 Α. A warrant, yes. 19 And he said that he explained to her that sometimes you Q. 20 need warrants but on this occasion it was a serious 21 incident that happened and they had got to protect the 22 forensic integrity of the property. What's your view on that description of obtaining consent from an occupier? 23 A. Well, obviously he hasn't obtained consent but, 24 25 you know, the situation there is that when he is

1 confronted with that he ought to then think about 2 getting a warrant. And that would be following the procedure we 3 Q. 4 described --5 Yes, yes, absolutely. Α. Q. -- earlier. Mrs Rashid gave evidence and in her Inquiry 6 7 statement at paragraph 3 said -- describes the officer coming to the door: 8 9 "I opened the door and he told me we needed to 10 vacate the property. I told him we wouldn't unless they had a warrant. He was very abrupt and quite rude and 11 12 said they didn't need a warrant to come into the house." 13 Presumably your comments on that would be exactly 14 the same? 15 Α. They are. And then also in his Inquiry statement at paragraphs 99 16 Q. 17 and 100, Miller said: "I'm asked what was my understanding when I went to 18 Zahid Saeed's home address of what our authority was for 19 20 seizing the property. My understanding was that the 21 decision had been made by the SIO that it has to be seized." 22 Is that sufficient to obtain consent? 23 24 Α. No. 25 Q. No. And he then went on to say:

"A decision had been made at a senior level that 1 this was a place of interest and that that was the 2 3 reason we were seizing the property. If there was 4 a need for a warrant it would have been 5 retrospectively." Given what you said earlier, what do you think the 6 7 prospects of obtaining a warrant retrospectively were? 8 Α. None. Thank you. Now, to go back to something you said at the 9 Q. 10 close yesterday, close of business yesterday, I asked 11 you for an example when we were talking about warrants 12 and consents and that was in regard to conflicts arising, issues arising, disputes arising with 13 14 householders and I asked could you think of any examples 15 where you as a Gold Group would expect to have conflicts or issues brought to your attention and at close 16 17 yesterday, it was late in the day, and you couldn't think of any examples --18 19 Yes. Α. -- at this moment. Can you think of any examples today 20 Q. 21 of where you as the Gold Group and you as Gold Commander 22 would have expected to have matters raised and brought to your attention? 23 Well, anything -- I can't think of an example at this 24 Α. moment, but anything that was significant in terms of 25

8

9

10

11

20

21

- conflict, then -- you know, or support, then that ought to be brought up the chain of command. It can be resolved lower, if it it can be resolved by the deputy SIO or by the SIO, but if it can't then it ought to be escalated up to Gold to have the situation resolved, so I can't really provide a good example at this moment in time, but I'm sure there will be.
 - Q. Is anything I have described in the circumstances we have discussed today about warrants and consents the type of information that you think would have benefited the Gold Group to hear about?
- 12 Well, it sounds like at ground level they were getting Α. 13 on with undertaking their duty in the way that they 14 thought was best, so it feels like a lot of that 15 wouldn't have been escalated up to Gold at that time. Of course Gold may well become aware of some of the 16 issues at a later stage, but I can't recall becoming 17 18 aware of any of the issues that you have outlined in 19 terms of consent at any stage but ...
 - Q. I'm just wondering whether looking back now you think it would have been helpful for Gold to have had these matters brought to their attention?
- A. Well, if it they had been brought to my attention then

 I would have done something to resolve them.
- Q. What would that have been?

A. Well, if it's about obtaining a warrant then it would be instructing someone to contact a Fiscal and there's already a Fiscal involved in this who knows the detail, so it would be a case of going to that individual, explaining the circumstances, what was required, why it was required and asking if a warrant could be craved and hopefully at some stage granted by the court, but that

would be with justification.

8

9

10

- Q. So you could have been involved directing or influencing some of the decisions that were being taken?
- 11 But I mean from my perspective that should not have to Α. 12 come to my level. It's -- all these issues ought to be 13 able to be resolved, everybody ought to know what the 14 procedures are and we've got one good example of 15 a police officer who obviously knows what his -- or 16 maybe he didn't but at least he had the sense to ask the 17 question, so -- in terms of the herbal substance, so 18 that's what you would expect of people, is if they're 19 not sure then escalate to get a resolution.
 - Q. And seek that advice from a more senior ranking officer?
- 21 A. Yes, exactly, exactly.
- Q. Can I ask you then about an example that I have been thinking of and you can tell me if this is not helpful.

 You are faced -- you are Gold Commander, you're faced with an unascertained death, there's an investigation

1 ongoing. The day after the death there's a post mortem 2 and the initial post mortem report says cause of death 3 is unascertained pending investigations, namely 4 toxicology, and there's -- one of the hypotheses that's 5 being developed is the unascertained death is because -is perhaps a drug induced death, it's possible and the 6 7 initial post mortem doesn't rule that out, and in fact they're waiting for toxicology results to determine 8 9 that. And so one of the hypotheses could develop into 10 perhaps there's been a supply of illicit drugs to the deceased by a third party and possibly a charge of 11 12 culpable homicide would be levelled against someone in 13 the future.

14 A. Yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. So a drug-induced death where that is a hypothesis that's been potentially going to develop. There's a number of properties to be secured, entered and searched as part of that investigation because the deceased had been in those properties earlier prior to death.

In that situation would the Gold Group want to be made aware if occupants in those properties declined to give consent for the properties to be secured, entered and searched?

25 A. Not necessarily.

- Q. Would that also be something that you would expect to be dealt with at a lower level?
- Most definitely. You know, people at that level ought 3 Α. 4 to know their powers and what's required of them. If 5 they're not sure, they escalate it, but normally they 6 would escalate it to a sergeant or inspector who, if the 7 constable wasn't sure, then either one of them ought to be and then ultimately in terms of warrants it would be 8 9 contact with the Procurator Fiscal Service, discuss and 10 outline the evidence, the information, why it was 11 necessary and crave a warrant.
 - Q. So it should be capable of resolution long before it gets up to the Gold Commander?
- 14 A. Yes.

12

13

- Q. And that would be even in the case where you are considering a potential homicide in relation to an unascertained death?
- A. So that would be part of the evidence gathering, so I -
 you know, I wouldn't expect to be involved in making

 decisions roundabout the evidence gathering. That's

 a matter for the SIO and so unless something -- it came

 to my attention that something was going completely

 awry, then I wouldn't intervene into how they were going

 about their business.
 - Q. I would like to ask you some further questions about the

25

1 detail of what was going on in the houses just for your impressions as Gold Commander that day. So if we go 2 3 back to Martyn Dick's property, we heard from 4 Martyn Dick in oral evidence -- and he has also given an 5 Inquiry statement -- he lived at the time with his then partner Kirsty MacLeod, now his wife. 6 7 The officers arrived between about 12.00 and 12.30 he said originally, maybe slightly later, but certainly 8 9 after the first Gold Group meeting and before the second 10 Gold Group meeting, so that's what was happening with 11 you. 12 He said nine or ten officers were sent to his home 13 on the Sunday morning, or Sunday lunchtime, that it was 14 intimidating, there were cars, the police arrived, they 15 all came into the house and only one of them spoke, there was nine in the house. 16 17 Can you help the Chair understand why nine officers would arrive at the home of Martyn Dick? There's no 18 suggestion that a crime occurred in his property. 19 20 So I don't know is the answer to that. I mean that's Α. 21 for whoever deployed nine officers to the house to give 22 evidence in terms of that, but at the end of the day it depends what they were looking for, but if they were 23 looking for something in terms of forensics -- and 24

I don't recollect what was said in relation to that, but

- then having nine officers in the property is not going to help from a forensics perspective. So it seems to me like -- if they thought they required nine officers for a search then, you know, the appropriate way to go about that would be for one/two to first approach the householder and then if it was required for a search to have nine people then absolutely fine, but it seems a lot of people in a house to carry out a search if indeed it's in relation to forensics for instance.
 - Q. And who would have deployed those officers? Would that be the crime scene manager or would it be a sergeant or would it be someone else?
 - A. Well, I don't know the detail of that, but presumably the SIO decided, or the deputy SIO decided that the house had to be seized, searched, whatever, and then he will have spoken to whoever was in charge of the officers at that time and asked them to deploy to the property, giving some instruction about what was required. But why it was nine people, I have absolutely no idea.
 - Q. We heard from Martyn Dick that as well as coming into the property that an officer was sent upstairs with them while they got changed, it had been a Sunday, they were in their house:
- 25 "Answer: They gave us nothing really -- gave us

1 nothing to go on whatsoever, just that we were going to be helping them and we should be helping them, so that's 2 3 what we did, just cooperated. But the fact they seized our house is still a mystery to us." 4 5 So when he came to give evidence he still wasn't able to give an explanation as to why they needed his 6 7 house to be seized. What comments would you have about that description? 8 Well, he should have been told why the house was being 9 Α. 10 seized from the beginning and if he hasn't then that's 11 just wrong. 12 Q. Right. We have a statement from Kirsty MacLeod, his 13 partner, and she says: 14 "One of the officers went upstairs with Martyn~..." 15 Martyn was getting changed: "... and stood outside his door. I got changed in 16 17 the bathroom and I think there was another officer standing out on the upstairs landing as well. Once 18 I got changed I was asked to leave my clothes on the 19 20 ironing board in the kitchen which I did. I'm not sure 21 what Martyn did with his clothes." What comment do you have about that, about officers 22 going upstairs, standing outside the door while the 23 occupants get changed and requiring them to provide 24 their clothing to officers? 25

- 1 Α. Well, so it depends -- it absolutely depends on what they have been briefed in relation to, so is it --2 3 you know, it feels like what ought to have happened is 4 they were allowed to get changed and then if the Police 5 Service wanted their clothes then they could seize the clothes but I don't know the detail of exactly what 6 instruction they were given, why they were given the 7 instruction and what it was they were trying to achieve 8 9 by not allowing people just to -- now, if you go to 10 search a house for drugs or whatever then fairly obviously you don't want people to be able to go and 11 12 dispose of drugs, but, you know, I absolutely don't know 13 the basis of why this house was being seized and the 14 detail of that and why it would be necessary to be with them when they were $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$ or at least be close by when 15 they're getting changed. 16 From what you know of the circumstances as 17 Q. 18 Gold Commander, can you help the Chair understand 19
 - perhaps a reason why this would have been done?
 - No, I honestly don't know. You would need to ask the Α. officers who were there and why that is what they did.
- 22 Well, thank you. Q.

20

21

An explanation that was given to Kirsty MacLeod 23 24 comes from her Inquiry statement, SBPI00220. I don't need this up on the screen, I will just tell you what it 25

1 says. It is paragraph 45: 2 "I asked if I could go and get changed and before 3 I went upstairs they told me to leave out the clothes I had been wearing. They explained this by saying they 4 5 might have to rule out my DNA from Shek as I had earlier told them that I had cuddled Shek when he arrived at the 6 7 house that morning." And then we have her original statement that she 8 9 gave to PIRC, 00054, where she said in there: 10 "They explained this by saying they might have to rule out my DNA from Shek ..." 11 12 Because of this cuddle. Can I ask you what you make 13 of that explanation that was given apparently to 14 Kirsty MacLeod? 15 Well, I would need to understand why they needed to rule Α. out her DNA from Shek because of a cuddle. I mean, 16 17 I don't know. 18 As Gold Commander in relation to this incident can you Q. 19 think of a reason why officers would need 20 Kirsty MacLeod's DNA from giving Shek a cuddle? 21 Α. No, but I mean if there was a reason for DNA to have to 22 be eliminated, so if his clothing or whatever had a number of different DNA on it, there might be a reason 23 why you would want to eliminate and, you know, so that 24 part of it has got nothing to do with the enquiry, or 25

- 1 whatever. But again that would be -- these would be
- 2 questions for the SIO and deputy SIO in terms of what it
- 3 was they were trying to achieve by understanding her DNA
- 4 being on other clothing.
- 5 Q. We would like to try and understand why, in relation to
- 6 this incident at Hayfield Road where Sheku Bayoh has
- 7 been restrained by officers, why there would be a need
- 8 to exclude Kirsty MacLeod's DNA. She wasn't present at
- 9 that time.
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. She wasn't at Hayfield Road. There was never any
- suggestion that she had been involved in any way with
- Mr Bayoh in an altercation or any other physical way
- other than the cuddle. Can you think of a reason why
- that would reasonably be required from Kirsty MacLeod?
- A. No, at this moment in time I can't, but the truth is,
- you know, I don't have that level of detail, I wouldn't
- 18 expect to have that level of detail, but whoever it is
- 19 that's directed that to happen is the individual who
- 20 ought to justify it and explain why it is that they felt
- that was important.
- Q. We would like to try and understand why that would be
- 23 important, if there is a reason you can think of then --
- A. No, sorry, I can't.
- 25 Q. All right, thank you. We have -- I have asked witnesses

- 1 about why DNA wasn't taken from the officers and
- 2 an answer that was given was, "That's already on file on
- 3 a database"; I think that's correct, is it?
- 4 A. That is correct, yes.
- 5 Q. There's also an SOP that permits officers' DNA to be
- taken and it relates to the firearms SOP we were talking
- 7 about yesterday.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. It doesn't happen in all circumstances and it depends on
- 10 the exact situation. At any time was there
- 11 consideration given by the Gold Group as to whether DNA
- should be taken from the officers?
- A. No, not at all, but as you already outlined it's already
- on the database, so it would be --
- 15 Q. So not necessary?
- A. So it wouldn't be necessary to take the DNA. Every
- officers' fingerprints and DNA are taken when they join
- the organisation and stored so they can be compared and
- 19 will be compared where again it is justified.
- Q. Right. Given what I have told you about the description
- 21 of events from the occupiers in Martyn Dick's house, do
- 22 you have concerns about the way that was handled? You
- 23 have obviously given us your views on the number of
- officers who attended, but do you have any views or any
- 25 concerns about the officers following them up the

stairs, standing outside, recovering clothing and requiring DNA?

- A. Well, so again back to what I said, it's about the officers that were there to justify why it is that they felt -- whether they were instructed to do that and it's someone else to justify it, but it would be posing the question of them. I don't know. I don't have that level of detail, I wouldn't expect to have that level of detail, but I would expect, you know, every house that consent is properly obtained and people are dealt with with respect -- fairness and respect, and if that's not what happened then that shouldn't be what's happening.
 - Q. We have heard from Martyn Dick and Kirsty MacLeod has given a statement, that they were taken to Kirkcaldy Police Office to give statements. They were taken separately in separate cars. Can you explain to us why that would be done in that situation?
 - A. Well, I don't know because I wasn't there, but I would assume that they wanted to speak to them separately and it would -- if there's a lengthy statement to be taken it would probably be more conducive in an office where they could have the space, perhaps show them a number of items if that was required, productions if that was required. I don't know the detail of that, but again it would be for the officers who actually brought them to

- 1 the office to give you an understanding of exactly why
- 2 that had happened, but of course there can be situations
- 3 where you want to keep people separate, you want to take
- 4 them into an office and then you want to interview them
- 5 and get a full statement from them.
- Q. What would the reasons be for keeping people separate?
- 7 A. So that they don't talk to each other.
- 8 Q. To avoid collusion or conferral or ...?
- 9 A. Exactly.
- 10 Q. After giving a statement, Martyn Dick explained that
- 11 when he left Kirkcaldy Police Office he met up with
- 12 Kirsty and it actually was Kirsty that told him that his
- friend Sheku Bayoh had died, so he had given a full
- 14 statement to the police officers over a number of hours
- and not been told that Mr Bayoh had died. Does that
- 16 cause you concern?
- 17 A. It causes me a lot of concern.
- 18 Q. Why?
- 19 A. Well, he ought to have been told so that when he gives
- 20 his statement he knows and understands exactly why he is
- 21 giving a statement.
- 22 Q. Thank you. We have heard from Dev Kapadia in this
- 23 Inquiry about Martyn Dick's house. He was a senior
- 24 Fiscal on duty that day, on call. This was on Day 38,
- 25 7 February this year, and he spoke about receiving

1		a call from police in connection with officers seeking
2		a drug search warrant for Martyn Dick's property. This
3		related to the herbal material. And he described in
4		evidence that it seemed to him at the time that the link
5		to the death, the death of Sheku Bayoh, was somewhat
6		tenuous. He said:
7		"Answer: It did not appear that the death resulted
8		from the drugs, or that there was any previous
9		intelligence of drug dealing at the property. It did
10		not appear to me that a search warrant was proportionate
11		in those circumstances."
12		And he said that:
13		"Answer: The amount the quantities were so small
14		they wouldn't be marked for court prosecution and they
15		would not reach the threshold for prosecution."
16		What would you expect police officers to do in that
17		situation, where they have contacted a Fiscal to seek
18		a drugs warrant and the Fiscal has expressed views that
19		it simply wouldn't be prosecuted because the amounts
20		I think the word he used in evidence was "minute",
21		"minute amounts".
22	Α.	Yes, so I would expect them to seize them and take no
23		other action.
24	Q.	Take no other action. Is that an action open to
25		officers, to take no other action?

- A. Well, they have already been clearly instructed by

 a Fiscal that the Fiscal is not prepared to take it

 forward in terms of prosecution, so it seems -- what

 course of action can you take?
 - Q. And would you expect those officers to charge the occupants of the property with offences under the Misuse of Drugs Act?
- Well, they may well have believed that that was the Α. right course of action because, as they believed, there was a quantity of herbal material there, but it seems -you know, if you interpret what the senior Fiscal has said then it's never going to go beyond -- so they can charge the individual but it's never going to go to prosecution -- it's never going to go to court and it's never going to go to prosecution, so it's in my view a needless use of their time to proceed with that.
 - Q. Thank you. We have heard that Martyn Dick and

 Kirsty MacLeod had a dog at the time and they had

 wanted -- they had left the property without dog food

 and Martyn Dick had a vehicle, his own vehicle, that he

 needed to go -- use for work and that a request had been

 made but they weren't provided with access to the

 property to recover those items and no one was willing

 to get those items for them, so Mr Dick wasn't able to

 go to work that evening because the house was still

- 1 secured by the officers. Do you have concerns about
- 2 that?
- 3 A. I do.
- 4 Q. What are those?
- 5 A. I mean, why would someone not just go and provide him
 6 with the keys for his car, or whatever? I don't know.
- 7 Q. Can you think of any reason why that wouldn't be done?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. I would like to move on to Zahid Saeed's property. We
 10 have heard that the police arrived there between about
 11 1.00 and 1.30 roughly that day, 3 May. I have asked you
 12 about consent and the warrant and such-like.
- We have heard evidence from Mrs Rashid and her 13 14 father. We have heard that one of the occupiers in the 15 property at that time was disabled, that he was in 16 a wheelchair and required specialist equipment which was 17 available in the home, he had aids and equipment, adaptations. He had mental health issues and issues 18 19 with communication as a result of a brain injury which 20 he had sustained. Can you tell us what would you expect 21 officers on the ground to do when they are dealing with 22 an occupier who has these difficulties?
- A. Well, take cognisance of what the difficulties are and make sure that we can support that individual.
- 25 Q. And what steps would you expect officers to take to

- secure reasonable access for him to the equipment that
 he needs?
- A. Well, so I suppose it would depend on whether, you know,

 it was deemed appropriate for him to access what he

 needed within his own property, or whether actually what

 we ought to do is take him outwith that property and

 find him what he required elsewhere, which presumably we

 would be able to access through our partners, NHS, some
 - Q. We have heard evidence that he had the need to lie down on occasions and he had a special bed adapted for his own use, so my understanding is it would not have been easy for that to be moved out of the property.

of the groups that we're involved with within NHS.

14 A. Okay.

9

10

11

12

- 15 Q. I mentioned Stuart Houston's Inquiry statement and we
 16 read out paragraphs to you earlier and we know that it
 17 was his impression as crime scene coordinator that all
 18 the police required was the clothing and the car, so in
 19 terms of what was inside the house they were looking
 20 for, it was simply clothing.
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. We have heard evidence, a suggestion that the family
 asked if they could remain in one room in the house,
 that the disabled son would be able to access the toilet
 and use the equipment that he needed, and that was

- 1 declined, that request. Does that cause you concern?
- 2 Yes, of course. Α.

12

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And why would that cause you concern? 3 Q.

doesn't seem too difficult.

- Well, I think it's fairly obvious that we should be 4 Α. 5 supporting the family in that situation and if we're merely looking for clothing and, you know, at this stage 6 7 I don't know exactly what they were looking for, but Stuart Houston says that, so I can't see any reason 8 9 whatsoever -- go in and seize the clothing, have the 10 family help you find the clothing and take it and then leave them to get on with their day-to-day business. It 11
- 13 And we have also heard evidence that Mrs Rashid had had Q. recent surgery, was on medication, as was -- she had 15 recently had a child, so she had a young baby and the baby had also had recent surgery. What would you expect 16 17 the police officers to do to assist her with her particular needs?
 - Well, find out what her particular needs were and deal Α. with it in an appropriate fashion, you know, be fair, respect people. You can still achieve what it is that you're trying to achieve, but do it in a proper fashion.
 - Q. We have heard that after the family were asked to leave she had forgotten some medication, she had forgotten to retrieve breast milk and breast pumps from the property.

- 1 Can you think of any reason why someone would not go and
- 2 get her --
- 3 A. No, absolutely no reason.
- Q. We have heard that her mother was an elderly woman who had health problems herself, was on medication. She spoke little or no English. Again, what would you
- 7 expect officers on the ground to do in terms of dealing
- 8 with the mother?
- 9 A. Well, treat her with fairness and respect. If we needed
 10 to get an interpreter to make sure that they knew and
 11 understood what was happening, then that's what we ought
 12 to be doing.
- Q. We have heard evidence from Mrs Rashid that she was
- 14 a Muslim woman, she was wearing traditional clothing,
- but she was given no explanation why the police were
- there asking them to leave the house. She had asked for
- a warrant. She was followed up to her bedroom while
- a male officer waited outside her room while she dressed
- 19 and that during the police visit she had made a call to
- a relative and the phone was grabbed from her hand by
- 21 the officer as she was on the phone.
- 22 Can I ask you to comment about that?
- 23 A. Well, none of that should have been done.
- Q. And why do you say that?
- 25 A. Well, back to what I said already: treating people with

1 fairness, respect. You know, you should respect individuals. I mean -- but at the end of the day all 2 3 this is about the individuals on the ground explaining 4 and justifying what it is that they have done, but it 5 feels like if everything that's said is true then they're not going to be able to justify it. 6 Could you help the Chair -- looking at what I have said 7 Q. to you -- and obviously it is a matter for the Chair 8 what evidence he accepts in the future --9 10 Α. Yes. -- but if he accepts any of that evidence, could you see 11 Q. 12 a way forward that situations like this could be avoided 13 in the future, where these things are handled well, handled properly? 14 15 Well, it sounds like there needs to be training, there Α. needs to be development of protocols and people's 16 understanding of exactly what's expected of them and 17 18 I'm -- you know, there will be protocols in place and 19 there will have been some training but it feels like if 20 all of this is what's happened then that training needs 21 to be reinforced. 22 And with your experience can you envisage the sort of Q. best type of training that would help officers make good 23 decisions in these scenarios? 24

Well, you know, a lot of the training will come from

25

Α.

```
1
             classroom-based, you know, understanding in terms of it
             sounds like diversity, actual protocols and how they go
 2
             about their business, what's expected of them and -- but
 3
 4
             some will be on the job training, so people getting
 5
             experience from other experienced people who have
             undertaken this work on a very regular basis.
 6
 7
         MS GRAHAME: Thank you. As with yesterday we have now
             reached half past eleven and I think what I would like
 8
 9
             to do now is ask to speak to the Chair and invite him to
10
             have a brief adjournment. So I will ask that the Chair
             could perhaps be brought on the screen.
11
12
                 I wonder if now might be an appropriate time for our
13
             morning break?
14
         LORD BRACADALE: Yes, thank you. We will stop for
15
             20 minutes at this point.
         (11.30 am)
16
17
                                 (Short Break)
18
         (11.56 am)
19
         LORD BRACADALE: Please continue, Ms Grahame.
20
         MS GRAHAME: Thank you.
21
                 I would just like to conclude the questions I'm
             asking in relation to the home of Zahid Saeed and we
22
             also heard evidence from Mrs Rashid that -- she is the
23
             sister of Zahid Saeed -- that outside the house
24
             the police searched her car and that at some point that
25
```

1 day, I don't have a precise time, Zahid Saeed was sitting -- was brought to the house by police officers 2 3 sitting in a car and her other brother or her dad went 4 over to talk to Zahid Saeed but the police wouldn't let 5 him talk to him and Zahid was kept in the car. I'm wondering if you can help us understand why that 6 7 wouldn't be permitted, that his family weren't allowed to speak to him? 8 No, I don't know. I don't have that level of detail of 9 Α. 10 exactly what it is that they were dealing with at that 11 stage, or why he was brought back, or why it would be 12 that they didn't want him to speak to anybody, but there 13 might be a reason for that. Can you think of a reason, you know, from your knowledge 14 Q. 15 of this incident in terms of your position as Gold Commander? 16 No, no, I can't, but neither can I say that that wasn't 17 Α. 18 justified. I just don't know because fairly obviously 19 the officers that were involved, if that's what's 20 happened, then they have believed that that's in the 21 best interests of the investigation that they were 22 carrying out. But again, that's for them to I think explain and to justify, so sorry, I just don't have the 23 level of detail that would allow me to make an informed 24 judgment. You know, if I had the whole detail then 25

- I would be able to help, I think.
- 2 Q. Thank you. I would like to move on to deal with
- 3 something we have heard evidence about from a number of
- 4 witnesses called hypotheses. I think we have mentioned
- 5 that very briefly before. I would like to look at it in
- 6 some detail now. So we have heard that when you have an
- 7 unascertained death as a police officer and you are
- 8 investigating why someone has died, that hypotheses will
- 9 be considered and developed, perhaps excluded --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- as you go along and essentially you're narrowing
- down, trying to determine what happened?
- 13 A. Yes, so it wouldn't necessarily be unexplained. You
- 14 could have hypothesis in terms of a murder enquiry, so
- where you know what the cause of death is, stab wound,
- a shooting, etc, but you would have hypotheses in terms
- of the individual responsible for it and ascertaining
- 18 exactly what's happened, so it's just slightly more
- 19 broad than just an unexplained death.
- Q. Right, thank you. We have heard evidence from
- 21 Garry McEwan about this and we have heard evidence from
- 22 Lesley Boal about this and we also heard evidence from
- 23 Lesley Boal about the stages -- the three stages of an
- 24 investigation and how you start considering hypotheses
- and they will develop as time moves on. We will come

1 back to that. We also heard evidence from Pat Campbell 2 that he was considering hypotheses as he was travelling 3 to Kirkcaldy and as SIO we have heard that that was 4 a sort of normal part of the process. 5 Α. Yes. Can I ask you to look at an Inquiry statement from 6 Q. 7 Lesley Boal, SBPI00233, and I'm going to look at a number of paragraphs. It's a summary of possible 8 9 hypotheses that could be developed in relation to this 10 incident and if we start -- you will see on the screen a witness statement from Detective Chief Superintendent 11 12 Lesley Boal, as she was then, which she gave the Inquiry 13 team last year and she gave evidence at Day 65 of the 14 Inquiry. 15 Can we start with paragraph 117. You will see this is headed up, "Investigative hypotheses", and she said: 16 17 "As SIO you have to consider what these hypotheses are and rule them in or out. Criminality of the 18 police officers is a hypotheses. It's for the SIO to 19 20 decide other hypotheses and what should be done to 21 investigate them. A number might be investigated together." 22 Do you agree with that description? 23 Yes, that's correct. 24 Α. 118: 25 Q.

1 "I think it's good to list what they are. I think 2 the hypotheses approach is mentioned in training. In 3 terms of the murder manual, which is a guide for how to 4 investigate homicides, there is a section on hypotheses 5 in that document. For me, and I can't say this for everybody, it allows me to think about every possibility 6 7 to make sure you're either eliminating a possibility or finding the evidence and following that evidence to see 8 how far it takes you." 9 10 Again, you agree with that? I do. 11 Α. 12 Q. 119: 13 "In terms of Mr Bayoh we learned later on there was 14 a disturbance at an address he had been at. The 15 question was whether Mr Bayoh was involved, who else was involved, what type of disturbance took place and was 16 17 anyone assaulted during the disturbance. One hypothesis for me would have been, was Mr Bayoh assaulted prior to 18 coming into contact with police and if so was the 19 20 assault relevant to any injuries he received or relevant 21 to the cause of death?" Is that a reasonable hypothesis? 22 Yes, it is, yes. 23 Α. Q. And we have heard evidence in relation to a physical 24 25 altercation that Mr Zahid Saeed had had with Sheku Bayoh

1 prior to his later death, so when she is talking about that, that's the altercation I think that is provided 2 3 the basis for that hypothesis? 4 Α. Yes. 5 Then if we go on to the next paragraph, 120: Q. "Another hypothesis would be, was his death due to 6 7 an underlying medical condition, information would be obtained from his GP and/or specialist and statement 8 9 from family members. If I was SIO I would normally list 10 my hypotheses or anything that may be relevant in terms of a potential cause of death." 11 12 So again, an underlying health condition, medical 13 condition could be one of the reasons why Mr Bayoh died? Yes, that's correct. 14 Α. 15 Q. And Lesley Boal gave evidence that that's quite a simple thing to start investigating, you can recover GP 16 17 records, medical records, and she said that the 18 pathologist would like those for the post mortem as 19 well. That's correct. 20 Α. 21 And she said -- Lesley Boal had had experience, she told Q. 22 us, as an SIO, and she said if she was SIO she would normally list her hypotheses. Is that something that 23 you would say is good practice? 24

A. Yes, I would say it's good practice, yes.

25

1

Q. Would that be listed in the policy file? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. And then she says: "I would note down the hypotheses and then allocate 4 5 out priority actions, the most likely hypotheses initially. Where there is no evidence to support 6 7 a hypothesis, it can be eliminated. That's not to say every SIO is the same, some will and some won't. Also 8 9 hypotheses ensure you don't exclude anything. Some things could be overlooked otherwise." 10 Do you agree with what she said? 11 12 Α. Yes, I agree with that. 13 And I think yesterday you gave evidence -- and we don't Q. 14 need to go into this any further -- that the hypothesis 15 about counter terrorism was very quickly checked out and excluded at an early stage? 16 That's right, yes. 17 Α. Q. And then 121 she said: 18 19 "Ch Supt McEwan and I didn't discuss the nature of 20 the investigation. Race as a possibility was not 21 discussed with Ch Supt McEwan. However, it is in the 22 back of your mind when you're thinking about all possibilities. In terms of hypotheses, one would have 23 24 been that the male had been treated differently because he was a black male. I can't remember having 25

25

1 a conversation with anybody else about it, but the feeling I got was that everybody was thinking along the 2 3 same lines as me that it was a possibility that the 4 actions of the police officers or a police officer was 5 because Mr Bayoh was black." 6 And again, do you agree that that was one of the 7 potential possible hypotheses? Yes, it might be, yes. 8 Α. So in terms of you as Gold Commander you had all of 9 Q. 10 those possibilities and all of those hypotheses in your 11 mind? 12 Α. Yes. Did you need Pat Campbell in the Gold Group to explain 13 Q. his hypotheses to you; is that part of the briefing? 14 15 No, so he went through in detail, but at the end of the Α. day the strategic intention -- and, you know, we have 16 17 gone through it in a bit of detail -- is to carry out 18 a thorough investigation, but in this case, the case 19 that we're dealing with at this moment in time, then 20 fairly obviously, as I have said on a number of 21 occasions, our role was to stabilise everything, make 22 sure that it was all held for a PIRC investigation which was going to be undertaken, so the organisation being 23 investigated. So yes, of course making sure that we 24

understood what the hypotheses were and make sure that

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- we gathered and secured all the information that would allow them to carry out an investigation that would consider every one of these hypotheses.
 - Q. So these are alive at an early stage and then, as

 I understand the evidence of Lesley Boal, the hypotheses

 develop and evolve as the investigation continues?
 - That's it. They come directly -- hypotheses come Α. directly from the murder manual which -- it will have been updated but I think it was written around about 2008 and it has been updated on a number of occasions. I think north of the border it's called Serious Crime Protocol but that protocol was taken directly from the murder manual which is written by the Association of Chief Police Officers Homicide Working Group and I actually sat on that group when the murder manual was written and I brought the murder manual north of the border and I had it revamped in terms of legislation from a Scottish perspective because obviously our legislation and our detention powers -- that's all changed now, but our detention powers were completely different from south of the border. So the vast majority of the theory of hypotheses developed by the Homicide Working Group and then brought here in terms of a Scottish understanding of -- so every SIO ought to know and understand about hypotheses and where that

- 1 comes from and then on the SIO course at Tulliallan they
- 2 would be taken through the various aspects of an
- 3 investigation and how to use hypotheses to support the
- 4 investigation that they're undertaking.
- 5 Q. So in terms of the role of an SIO who is heading up --
- 6 the senior investigative officer heading up an
- 7 investigation, if that relates to someone's death they
- 8 will have had training in hypotheses and the use of
- 9 hypotheses?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And they are designed to help the investigation and make
- sure nothing is missed?
- 13 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 14 Q. And when we were talking about hypotheses, and
- 15 Lesley Boal has given us this description, does this
- 16 protocol specify that underlying health conditions could
- 17 be a hypothesis?
- A. Does the manual specify that? No. I mean it's left
- 19 open in terms of the particular circumstances, so you
- 20 couldn't specify in a manual just every single enquiry
- 21 you would come across because we have many enquiries
- 22 and -- well, every one wouldn't be that different, but
- they will have -- every one will have nuances and will
- 24 be a bit different, so just understanding the theory of
- 25 hypotheses and then applying that to what it is that you

1 have in front of you, so a hypothesis for every element 2 of what it is that would be important, so that you don't go down one route, you know, and leave everything else 3 4 behind. You take everything with you and as you 5 eliminate -- so if you have five hypotheses then one at 6 a time you will eliminate the hypotheses until you come 7 to have one that says whatever it's -- whatever the conclusion happens to be at that point. 8 Q. Right. And what do you need to eliminate a hypothesis? 9 10 Α. It will depend what the hypothesis is, so ... Let's look at, for example, underlying health condition. Q. 11 12 Α. Yes. And so that's a hypothesis, a possibility? 13 Q. 14 Α. Yes. 15 And you maybe recover GP records, hospital records, Q. 16 information from the family? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And would you then send that to the pathologist --Q. 19 Α. Yes. -- who is carrying out the post mortem? 20 Q. 21 Α. Yes, so somebody would go to the post mortem and would 22 take that so that the pathologist has that available to 23 them. And would you look at the records and say, "That's 24 Q.

enough, we're excluding that", or would you wait until

1 the post mortem has been concluded and see what the 2 pathologist said? Yes, exactly. So as a police officer you wouldn't have 3 Α. 4 the knowledge, the ability to make a determination 5 without having medical expertise applied to it, so take it along, the pathologist will have a look at all of 6 7 that and decide whether in fact there was an underlying -- of course the records -- the GP records, 8 the health records may well show that there was in any 9 10 event so -- and in which case it might not be eliminated, but the pathologist would be able to say 11 12 whether it has an impact, you would hope, on the death 13 or not. So it remains alive until you have gathered in all the 14 Q. 15 information you can get --16 Yes, that's correct. Α. -- about the person's prior health history and then 17 Q. 18 a decision would be taken to exclude that hypothesis or 19 say this is actually the reason? Yes, that's it. 20 Α. 21 So in that situation, with that example, you're not Q. 22 going to say, within the first 24 hours/48 hours, "We

don't have evidence from the pathologist but we're

satisfied that we can exclude this as a cause"?

23

24

25

Α.

No.

- 1 Q. And if the pathologist produces an initial post mortem
- 2 saying, "Cause of death unascertained pending further
- investigations", would you wait until those further
- 4 investigations have been carried out?
- 5 A. You should.
- Q. You should. Thank you. In relation to the other
- 7 example that was given here, the possibility of an
- 8 assault, what would you do as an investigator in
- 9 relation to that hypothesis?
- 10 A. Well, you would gather information in relation to it, so
- 11 take statements, understand what happened, and again
- take that detail to the pathologist to say there's
- a suggestion that there was an altercation previously,
- 14 that there was an injury previously, you know, whatever
- 15 the detail is, and so that they can make the best
- informed judgment on what they see.
- Q. We have also heard evidence from the pathologist in this
- 18 case who talked about injuries underlying the external,
- 19 so internal injuries that maybe wouldn't be obvious from
- 20 the external presentation of the body. So again, if you
- 21 had an initial post mortem report saying unascertained
- 22 cause of death, again would you be waiting until you get
- 23 the final post mortem report to take a view on that
- 24 hypothesis?
- 25 A. Yes, so you would follow the evidence. So, you know, if

- 1 you haven't got all the statements and the detail at the 2 time that you have the initial post mortem then you 3 subsequently bring that detail to the pathologist to say 4 you know, "We now understand that there's been an 5 altercation and there might have been injury", or 6 whatever, "Has that had any impact on the cause of 7 death?" We heard from Dr Shearer, the pathologist, that there 8 Q. 9 can be very obvious injuries such as blunt force 10 injuries, stab wounds to the heart, a shot to the head, that make it very clear at a very early stage what the 11 12 cause of death was. 13 Yes, of course. Α. 14 And presumably that's something that -- circumstances Q. 15 can be taken into account? Yes, that's right. 16 Α. If it's an obvious cause? 17 Q. 18 A. Yes, that's right. 19 Q. And then in relation to this possibility that we see on
- the screen at 121, this hypothesis that the male had
 been treated differently because he was a black male,
 can you explain to us how you would go about
 investigating this hypothesis?
- A. Well, you would have to, you know, understand exactly what's happened and whether the police officers took

- 1 a different course of action because of -- because the 2 person was black, so you would have to understand what 3 it was they did and why it was they did it and what was 4 their -- you know, what -- why they made the judgments 5 that they actually made, so -- but these would be taking statements from a variety of people roundabout, 6 7 understanding CCTV and see what had happened and how the person was arrested and then from the statements of the 8 9 officers themselves understanding exactly what it is 10 that they did.
- 11 Q. And you wouldn't rule out that possibility until you have obtained all of that information?
- 13 A. No, no, not at all.
- Q. Right, and so you have talked about statements from people, would that be possible eye-witnesses?
- 16 A. Eye-witnesses, CCTV.
- 17 Q. CCTV. And statements from the police officers 18 themselves?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. We also heard from Lesley Boal that looking at the
 Airwaves transmissions at the time might be helpful
 evidence?
- 23 A. Yes, of course.
- Q. She talked about disciplinary records could perhaps be part of the evidence gathering.

- 1 A. Yes, I agree.
- Q. We have also heard about call cards or STORM cards, that
- 3 might provide interesting information about the
- 4 circumstances.
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Do you agree with all of that?
- 7 A. Yes, all of that, so you want to gather all of that
- 8 information.
- 9 Q. And again, the outcome of the post mortem --
- 10 A. Yes, absolutely.
- 11 Q. -- may be a factor?
- 12 A. Absolutely.
- Q. And in a situation where the cause of death in the
- initial post mortem is unascertained, would that -- that
- 15 wouldn't permit you to exclude any hypotheses
- 16 presumably?
- 17 A. No, not at all, not at all. You're waiting for further
- information and further detail and potentially further
- 19 examination, so ...
- Q. Right, thank you. We heard from Lesley Boal in relation
- 21 to this hypothesis, she explained that it can be
- 22 difficult to investigate the motivation behind actions.
- 23 A. Yes, of course.
- Q. Would you agree with that?
- 25 A. No, I absolutely agree with that.

- 1 Q. And she talked about looking at the possibility whether Mr Bayoh's ethnicity had impacted or caused officers to 2 3 react differently at their initial attendance and so 4 when they first had contact with Mr Bayoh and thereafter 5 during the restraint of Mr Bayoh, whether that is stereotyping, discrimination, whether they wanted to 6 7 undertake a sort of malicious act, intent or recklessness in terms of his care, and that is the sort 8 of thing you're looking at when you're investigating 9 10 whether race was a factor? Yes, absolutely. 11 Α. 12 And she explained that it would help an investigating Q. 13 officer if they knew what the attending officers had 14 done, whether they had been engaged in the restraint? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Whether they had not been engaged, if they were Q. 17 witnesses to things, what had happened, who had done
- 19 A. Yes.

what --

18

- 20 Q. -- and I think she said in evidence -- and I'm

 21 summarising here -- that on 3 May it was difficult to

 22 have a clear view on what the officers had actually

 23 done --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- the officers who were gathered in the canteen, she

- didn't have a clear picture of who had done what.
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. Would that accord with your recollection of events on
- 4 3 May?
- 5 A. No, that's absolutely correct.
- Q. And until -- we have heard officers gave statements to
- 7 PIRC on 4 June, just over a month after these events,
- 8 and you have told us yesterday you didn't actually have
- 9 copies of those statements and you told us yesterday you
- 10 didn't have copies of -- well, they weren't completed,
- use of force or use of spray forms.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. So at what point was it possible for Police Scotland to
- 14 exclude this hypothesis that race was a factor, in the
- absence of statements or forms or any of that
- 16 information?
- 17 A. Well, so when the PIRC carried out their investigation
- and concluded that investigation you would expect -- and
- 19 we're talking here about the Police Service and what
- 20 the Police Service would do, but you would expect that
- 21 when the enquiry is handed over to the PIRC, that that's
- 22 exactly what they would be investigating as well. So
- from a Police Scotland perspective, you know, as I said
- 24 before, it's about stabilising, it's about holding
- everything, making sure -- just everything that Lesley

1 has spoken about there, making sure that we've got that, that's available to the PIRC and that they then are 2 3 allowed -- you know, that we don't interfere in that in 4 any way whatsoever, they are allowed to go and carry out 5 an independent, objective enquiry and then to come back -- and in this case they have come back to the 6 7 Fiscal with the facts. I don't know, I haven't seen that report, I don't know what it says, but I would have 8 9 expected that all of these hypotheses would have been 10 considered. Now, of course -- and some of them are 11 12 ex-police officers and some of them will have used this 13 in the past, but I don't know and I wouldn't speculate 14 on exactly what the expectation from a PIRC perspective 15 is. And just thinking about that at the moment, so these are 16 Q. 17 hypotheses that an SIO would be considering, developing 18 as part of a police investigation. 19 Yes. Α. And you would anticipate that from the handover that 20 Q. 21 PIRC would continue with those hypotheses? 22 Α. Yes. And bearing in mind what you have said about PIRC having 23 Q. an independent investigation, presumably what you're 24 25 saying is that they wouldn't be limited to the police

- 1 hypotheses if they felt there were other important
- 2 hypotheses to consider?
- 3 A. No, absolutely not.
- Q. So they could continue with the police hypotheses, they
- 5 could perhaps add to them --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- themselves, based on their own investigation?
- 8 A. Yes, yes.
- 9 Q. And in terms of sharing those hypotheses -- we have not
- 10 heard from PIRC yet about what they have done or
- 11 training they have had in hypotheses.
- 12 A. No, no.
- 13 Q. But in terms of that handover between say Pat Campbell,
- 14 the SIO, and the PIRC investigation, can you explain to
- us what your expectations would be in terms of that
- sharing of information about hypotheses and that --
- 17 A. I would expect us to share everything that we had in
- 18 terms of property, productions, CCTV witnesses, to have
- a discussion roundabout who was going to be doing what
- in the future. And yes, Pat Campbell explaining what it
- 21 was that he was investigating, so what were his
- 22 hypotheses and then handing that over to the PIRC, but
- I wouldn't expect the PIRC to tell us what their
- 24 hypotheses were, so they come up with their own,
- 25 you know. So whether they would describe it as

25

1 hypothesis or something else, I don't know, but -- so -but I wouldn't expect them to share that with us. 2 3 I would expect them to get on with the enquiry and they 4 would have an expectation that we would give them 5 everything that we had, that we would hand -- everything that Lesley has spoken about there, that we would hand 6 7 that over to them and that they would carry out the investigation on behalf of the Crown Office and 8 Procurator Fiscal Service. 9 10 Q. So in a way even if Pat Campbell didn't give any of his own hypotheses to PIRC, you would expect PIRC would 11 12 develop and evolve their own views about possibilities? 13 Α. Yes. Whether they call them hypotheses or not, but they would 14 Q. 15 develop their own theories that they would investigate? 16 Α. Yes. And presumably from what you have said you would expect, 17 Q. 18 either because they have been told by Pat Campbell or 19 they have developed it themselves, that one of the 20 possibilities that they would look into would be that 21 Mr Bayoh was treated differently because he was black? 22 Α. Yes. Thank you. Lesley Boal talked about it was clear at 23 Q. that time in 2015 that this was a black male who had 24

been restrained, he had become unresponsive during

- restraint, it wasn't a unique case in the sense that

 this had happened before elsewhere in the UK and we have

 also heard other people talking about, you know,
- 4 worldwide there are examples.
- 5 A. Yes.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. At a very early stage there was mention of George Floyd and we have heard of people down south who have been restrained by police and who have subsequently lost consciousness and died. Was that something that you were aware of, the global picture or the national picture across the UK?
- 12 A. Absolutely, definitely, yes.
- Q. Right. So was this something in your mind at the time
 that you were considering how the investigation would be
 conducted?
 - A. Yes, well, so I think we had to be absolutely cognisant of that but, as I said, the most important thing at that moment in time is to allow the PIRC to carry out that enquiry and potentially not for us to say, "Well, we think it is this and we think it's that, we don't think it's this", but to say "You've got everything now, anything else that you want please ask and then please get on with the enquiry", because as I said yesterday on a few occasions, I suppose, you know, the sooner the PIRC pick it up, are carrying out an independent

1 objective enquiry, the better overall for the Police Service. Of course we might have got things wrong and 2 3 if we did then we need to do something about it, so we 4 need to learn from it, so the quicker we find that out 5 and learn from it and change things, different procedures, the better for everybody, the more 6 7 confidence the public will have in us and the more confidence families and communities can have in us. 8 So the importance of their independence and us not 9 10 necessarily interfering into that, or not interfering into that independence at all is really important. 11 12 Q. I was going to ask you later today but I might as well 13 ask you now about learning lessons. I mean, how 14 difficult was it for the police to learn lessons in the 15 absence of getting the PIRC report or any detail from 16 PIRC? Well, I mean -- so it would be difficult because in many 17 Α. 18 ways we would have to go back and reinvestigate some of 19 the things that have already been investigated, but, 20 you know -- but, you know, as I said, we try to learn 21 from every incident, that's what we should be doing 22 but --Q. Were you in -- sorry, I interrupted there. 23 24 Α. No, no, go on. Sorry. 25 Q. Sorry about that. I was going to ask you were you

- 1 involved in any learning lessons exercises after the
- 2 death of Mr Bayoh?
- 3 A. No, I wasn't, no.
- 4 Q. No? Were you asked to contribute to any learning
- 5 lessons courses?
- 6 A. No, I can't remember at this stage. So I would have
- 7 done, you know, the Gold Group and over to PIRC and then
- I would have got on -- you know, at some stage once
- 9 I was content that it was stabilised, as I have said
- 10 many times, I would have then gone on to do the job that
- I was expected to do in terms of Police Scotland. So
- 12 I would have walked away at that and allowed this
- enquiry then to continue because at some stage I was
- 14 content that the PIRC were engaged, they were carrying
- out the investigation and I suppose wrongly I assumed
- 16 that we would have got some sort of feedback from the
- 17 PIRC in terms of -- and then -- so that would have been
- 18 fed into the force centrally -- sorry, this is what
- 19 I assumed would happen and of course I may be completely
- 20 wrong in that, and that was never going to happen, but
- 21 that's what I assumed would happen and so it's maybe
- 22 a missed opportunity on my part that we should have done
- 23 something else.
- 24 Q. And in terms of that assumption, that they would come
- 25 back, had you been given information in relation to the

1 PIRC investigation, either from PIRC themselves or from the Crown, would that have assisted you in learning 2 3 lessons? Yes, if there was feedback from the PIRC or feedback 4 Α. 5 from the Crown then -- but I assume the feedback from the Crown would have gone directly back to either 6 7 Neil Richardson through PSD, or feedback from the PIRC would have come back in it through that route, not 8 through myself. 9 10 Q. So you think it would actually have been Professional 11 Standards --12 Α. Yes. 13 -- who would have maybe had that ongoing contact or Q. 14 possible contact? 15 Α. That's it, yes. That's correct. Did Professional Standards ever get in touch with you 16 Q. about a learning lessons exercise? 17 No, not that I recall. 18 Α. 19 Right. Going back to the hypotheses that we were Q. 20 talking about, can I ask you as Gold Commander what role, if any, would you have had in listening to the 21 22 hypotheses, discussing the hypotheses? We know yesterday you asked about counter terrorism, but apart 23 from that was there any discussion at Gold Group 24

meetings about the hypotheses?

25

- 1 Α. There may have been some discussion, but -- in terms of what the strategy was, but I would need to look at the 2 3 minutes of the meetings to see whether that was the case 4 or not, so -- but I wouldn't expect to be dictating, if 5 that's the right word, what the hypothesis would be. I would expect the SIO to understand what the incident 6 7 was and then to come up with a hypothesis himself, as it was in this case, but -- so -- and, you know, so someone 8 9 as experienced as him and someone as experienced as 10 Lesley Boal, as we have seen, should be allowed to come up with hypotheses that they believe are correct for 11 12 that investigation, so I wouldn't interfere into that 13 unless there was something so obvious that I should interfere into it. 14
 - Q. Do you think that what's described in paragraph 121 on the screen about the race hypothesis, if I can call it that, do you think that was obvious to everybody involved that day?
- 19 A. I think it should have been.

15

16

17

18

20 Q. Do you think it was? You will see from this, I have
21 read it out to you, Lesley Boal didn't speak -- she
22 didn't remember having a conversation with anyone else
23 about it, but the feeling she got was that everybody was
24 thinking along the same lines. Would that accord with
25 your --

24

25

1 Α. I think that's probably right, yes. Okay. So if we have heard that people weren't thinking 2 Q. 3 along those lines, what would you make of that? 4 Α. Well, I think that they should be thinking about that. 5 But, you know, again it's back to what I have said already, you know, we aren't the investigating 6 7 institution, we are being investigated and so it's allowing the investigators to come up with the 8 9 hypothesis and to carry out a thorough investigation to 10 understand exactly what it is that happened on that day. Thank you. We have heard evidence in this Inquiry that 11 Q. 12 some witnesses have said there was simply no evidence 13 that this was racially motivated and there was nothing 14 from the outset to suggest that the actions of the 15 officers were because Mr Bayoh was black. I'm interested in any comment you have about that, the idea 16 17 that there was nothing at the outset and so --18 Well, I think it depends on how you define evidence. So Α. was there -- there was no evidence at the very 19 20 beginning, so, you know, so some people will be saying 21 that because -- you know, you follow the evidence, so you wait until -- without making a determination, 22 without deciding: oh, it's definitely this, or it's 23

definitely that, you keep a broad perspective in terms

of your hypotheses, so five or six hypotheses and you

1 work your way through each one. You understand that some are eliminated very quickly and very easily, some 2 3 will be really difficult to eliminate but at some stage 4 you will come to a point where there is only one 5 hypothesis left and as long as you have kept it broad enough and you allow -- and you have thought of 6 everything, then -- because if you haven't thought of 7 everything then when you come to the last one then it 8 9 might just have been something else that you needed to 10 have thought about, so it's just making sure that you're open -- completely open-minded, don't jump down a route 11 12 and say: oh, well, I think it was this, or I think it 13 was that, you know, don't do any of that, just follow the evidence. That's the -- from my perspective that's 14 15 the important thing to do. And then -- because we end up -- and it will have happened, you know, we say one 16 17 thing and then discover weeks down the road that it's 18 absolutely not that and it wasn't that and then you have to start working your way back and then trying to move 19 20 forward and weeks later it's much, much more difficult 21 to move forward. So take everything with you and follow 22 all the evidence and if you do that then you will have a thorough enquiry and you will have the proper outcome 23 for what it is that you have done. 24

 ${\tt Q.}\,\,$ Does this go back to what you said earlier this morning

25

1 that you are keeping an open mind, you're keeping these hypotheses alive and you're not excluding things until 2 3 you've got all the evidence --4 Α. Absolutely correct. 5 -- that allows you to do that? Q. Absolutely right. 6 Α. 7 And in relation to this particular hypothesis, I think Q. you said not long ago that you would want statements 8 from the police officers --9 10 Α. Yes. -- which were obviously taken by PIRC by this stage in 11 Q. 12 this particular investigation but you would -- from 13 a police perspective you would want those before you 14 ruled anything out? 15 A. That's correct. 16 Q. Thank you. 17 Can I ask you to look at your Inquiry statement please and at paragraph 121 I think. I just want to put 18 19 this into context of what we're discussing now, so that 20 there's no confusion. You say here, 121: 21 "Race wasn't a factor for Police Scotland to 22 investigate at that time. These are always things that you have in your mind. From my perspective the 23 investigation into what's actually happened and the 24 causes are with the PIRC. If they come back and say 25

1 there's an element of racism then you have to do something about that. As far as I know in the time 2 3 I was there, there was no suggestion that race played 4 a part in what happened. I have been asked if there was 5 anything to suggest race wasn't a factor. I don't suppose there was, but from what was reported at the 6 7 beginning we had an individual running about between cars with a knife, that's the action of the individual 8 9 I think. As the investigation goes on there's a better 10 understanding of what goes on there. From that initial part of the investigation it didn't feel to me like race 11 12 was the cause of this happening. Thorough investigation 13 ought to unearth all the various aspects of what 14 happened. You're open to all of it, so in these 15 investigations you're looking for all the issues and understanding all the issues. This includes 16 17 understanding the motivations of Mr Bayoh and the police officers." 18 19 So I'm taking that paragraph in its entirety. 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. And I wonder -- if we look at the first line, and 22 I don't want there to be any confusion, you say: "Race wasn't a factor for Police Scotland to 23 investigate at that time." 24 25 Can you put this paragraph into context in the light

a hypothesis --

25

1 of what you have already told us today? Yes, just exactly what I said was the investigation into 2 Α. 3 the cause of death, what happened is for the PIRC to 4 investigate, so from our perspective it was about 5 stabilising everything, making sure that everything was available to the PIRC and for them to continue with 6 7 their investigations. So I have gone through there to say: well, at that point there was no evidence of what 8 9 had happened, so I was keeping a very open mind in terms of what we were doing. So I wasn't going down the route 10 of saying, "Yes, it's racism", I was saying: well, 11 12 there's no evidence of that at this moment in time but 13 it's in the back of my mind that that might be the case, 14 but let's get an enquiry done before we start to make 15 allegations against anyone. Once we carry out a proper, thorough investigation then we can make whatever 16 17 assertions or allegations that we want to make at that 18 point, but to make assertions and allegations at the 19 very beginning wouldn't be the right thing to do. And presumably it goes back to what you have just said 20 Q. 21 about the hypothesis remains a live one? 22 Α. Yes. And equally you don't want to make unfounded 23 Q. 24 allegations, but you don't want to exclude

- 1 A. No absolutely.
- 2 Q. -- that race is a factor until you have investigated all
- 3 the evidence you can gather?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. And part of that, which you say at the end of this
- 6 paragraph, is I think you mention the police officers --
- 7 understanding the motivations of Mr Bayoh and the
- 8 police officers.
- 9 A. Yes, absolutely.
- 10 Q. And is a part of that getting the statements of the
- 11 police officers?
- 12 A. It is, yes.
- 13 Q. Lovely, thank you.
- 14 Can I ask you if you were aware in your role that --
- we have heard evidence from the family that they had
- raised, on 3 May, the possibility that race was
- 17 a factor. Was that something that was drawn to your
- 18 attention in the Gold Group?
- 19 A. Well, I don't recollect that, but it may well have been.
- But back to what I said, you know, please let us carry
- 21 out -- have an investigation and then we will make
- judgments as we move forward, so without pre-judging --
- 23 so if the family come and make allegations that it is --
- you know, it's motivated by race, then that ought to
- 25 feed through at least to the SIO in terms of what his

- 1 consideration -- and then that needs to be fed to the
- 2 PIRC, you know, and that information needs to be fed to
- 3 the PIRC in terms of what investigation they carry out.
- 4 Q. Who would be responsible for sharing that information
- 5 with the PIRC?
- 6 A. Well, the SIO.
- 7 Q. The SIO. And in terms of if the family have had
- 8 a discussion with officers from Police Scotland who
- 9 have -- where they have raised the issue that race was
- 10 perhaps a factor in his death, would it be for those
- 11 individual officers to then share that with the SIO?
- 12 A. Yes, I would assume that at some stage a statement would
- be taken outlining the detail of -- and why they believe
- that that's the case, so that would be a starting point
- in terms of having that understanding. But again,
- 16 you know, just joining all that together, with all the
- 17 rest of the information that comes in and then being
- able to -- once you've got all the information in the
- 19 round, being able to make a judgment on what exactly it
- is that you've got, but without pre-judging what you
- 21 have at that point.
- 22 Q. And in terms of taking statements, that would be
- something that PIRC would be doing as part of the
- investigation, is it?
- 25 A. Well, so, you know, we spoke yesterday about the

1 officers providing operational statements, but they 2 wouldn't go into the level of detail that you would 3 require for that, so when it came to providing detailed 4 statements then these are the kind of questions that you 5 would expect would be asked at that time. And that would be by PIRC? 6 Q. 7 And that would be by PIRC. We would have no involvement Α. whatsoever. 8 And that would relate to taking statements from the 9 Q. family? 10 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. And the officers who had maybe been part of that 13 discussion with the family? 14 That's correct, yes. Α. 15 Q. And then certainly from a police perspective the PIRC could collate all of that information and develop their 16 17 own hypotheses or whatever it is they wish to call it? 18 Α. No, exactly. Can I ask you to look at paragraphs 309 and 310 of your 19 Q. 20 Inquiry statement. So that's 309 and 310 and it says: 21 "We take cognisance of what their perceptions are and understand what is factually following from their 22 perception. So for example if the community thinks it's 23 24 the fault of the police officers, then the investigation has to address that. 25

"I have been asked if racism was a perception of the 1 community the investigation was required to address. 2 3 I take cognisance of that. I was aware and open to it." 4 So this is moving on from just the family's view, 5 this relates more to the community. Can you tell us a little bit more about what you were -- how you saw the 6 7 views of the community as impacting on the investigation? 8 Well, so it's exactly the same as we spoke about in 9 Α. 10 terms of the family, so depending on, you know, what the community perception was and how we understood that and 11 12 whether one of the community leaders or members of the 13 community was expressing a view that it was racism, 14 you know, so it would be then understanding why that 15 was, take a statement in relation to that and -- and at the end of the day, even if they weren't prepared to 16 17 provide a statement you would be taking -- I spoke about it already -- you'd be taking cognisance of that in 18 19 terms of the investigation anyway, so~... But you would 20 factor that in as the fact that that was a perception. 21 Q. Right. And can I ask you to look at paragraph 96 now 22 please. I'm interested from the second line there: "... in terms of community tensions, community 23 engagement, we need to appoint someone outside. We 24 might appoint someone from Safer Communities and media. 25

Depends on the incident. I can't remember who else." 1 2 I'm interested in the idea of someone being 3 appointed from the outside. Can you tell us who were 4 you thinking of at that time? So it's just -- it was engagement with, you know, 5 Α. liaison groups, so we would have advisors in terms of 6 the NISAG, which is National Independent Strategic 7 Advisory Group, which has a number of members of 8 9 different communities who sit on that and who were in 10 a position to provide us with whatever advice it is that we would require in terms of the incident that was 11 12 unfolding or had unfolded. 13 Thank you. So this would be a partnership -- people who Q. are outside of Police Scotland --14 15 Α. So people outside ---- but who support Police Scotland? 16 Q. So I think I said yesterday we would look -- so 17 Α. Nicola Shepherd was looking locally and then we would 18 have, from a Safer Communities, you know, central 19 20 position looking nationally at exactly what was taking 21 place so~... And then -- so that's from a policing 22 perspective and then that engagement with the various 23 advisors that we had roundabout the country that would be able to help us provide advice in relation to the 24 kind of incident that we had ongoing. 25

- 1 Q. So it would be Nicola Shepherd who would -- was she
- 2 Bronze Commander in relation to this?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And she would update the Gold Group in relation to
- 5 issues on these matters, would she?
- 6 A. That's right, yes.
- 7 Q. Thank you. Can I ask you, we have heard evidence and we
- 8 may hear further evidence in the Inquiry about searches
- 9 that were carried out by police officers in relation to
- 10 people connected to Mr Bayoh, including his legal
- 11 representative -- or the family's legal representative.
- 12 Pat Campbell gave evidence when I asked him about this
- that he wouldn't have found any of that very helpful to
- 14 his investigation. Are you aware of any reason why that
- may have been helpful to an investigation?
- 16 A. Sorry, can you please --
- 17 Q. Searches done on databases in connection with people
- 18 connected to Mr Bayoh, for example Collette Bell --
- 19 A. Right.
- Q. -- who was his partner and also his family's solicitor.
- 21 A. Searches in relation to the family solicitor?
- 22 Q. Yes.
- 23 A. I can't think why anybody would think that was
- 24 beneficial.
- 25 Q. Right, thank you. We were looking through the

Gold Group meeting minutes yesterday.

1

2 Α. Yes. I think we had pretty much come to the end of the second 3 Q. Gold Group meeting. Let's just go back to that briefly 4 to conclude it. It is PS07268 and we started talking 5 about this yesterday. This is the one at 14.40 where 6 7 PIRC had arrived and were present at the Gold Group meeting. 8 Yes. 9 Α. 10 Q. I wonder if we could look at page 2, item 3 on the agenda and we did go through some of this yesterday. 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. You will see that at bullet point 4 it says: 14 "Discussion re [post mortem] is likely to be carried 15 out tomorrow afternoon ..." So this is the meeting at 14.40 on the 3rd and the 16 17 post mortem was --18 Α. The next day. 19 -- due to take place the following day on the 4th: Q. 20 "... [crime scene manager] to be deployed for each 21 loci. Formal identification of deceased required." 22 You have given us evidence about what your expectations were in relation to that. 23 24 Then towards the bottom of that page there's comment 25 about a next of kin strategy:

"... No formal ID ... but ID has been done by 1 a Facebook image initially." 2 3 Do you have any recollection of a discussion at this 4 Gold Group meeting about identification by a Facebook 5 image? 6 No. Α. 7 No? Do you see the final bullet point there: Q. "FLO to be briefed in relation to equality and 8 diversity, [next of kin] has been informed by DC Parker 9 10 and DC Mitchell." We have heard evidence that those were the officers 11 12 who delivered the death message. 13 Yes. Α. What were your expectations in relation to the FLO being 14 Q. 15 briefed regarding equality and diversity? Well, so my expectation would be that they would be 16 Α. 17 asked if they were au fait with what the equality and diversity issues were and if they weren't then being 18 briefed about that, but I don't know the detail of that 19 20 to be honest. 21 Q. All right. Can I ask you to look at another set of 22 minutes, PS03139. This I think is the third Gold Group meeting. Now, we have heard that there was a meeting at 23 19.50 hours and these minutes say 20.15 hours. Do you 24 remember what the time was? 25

- 1 A. No, I don't.
- 2 Q. So again you will see that you were chairing the third
- 3 Gold Group meeting.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. This is in the evening. We have heard by this stage
- 6 Garry McEwan had gone to visit the next of kin.
- 7 Can we move down to item 2 please. You see that
- 8 there was an update given by Pat Campbell.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. A witness had come forward saying she had videoed the
- 11 aftermath of the incident at the locus on her mobile
- 12 phone and there was a task to seize that.
- Then if we look at item 3, "Investigative process",
- again you appear to have been given -- if we move up the
- 15 screen -- an update in this regard. Now, you will see
- the last bullet point there in item 3 says:
- "CCTV for police vehicle that attended has not been
- working since March 2015, seized regardless."
- 19 Do you remember that part of the discussion?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. We have heard evidence that the Transit van which was
- 22 the first to arrive at the scene had a means of
- recording but that hadn't been working.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Did you know -- did you have concerns, did you know

24

25

1 anything about that? 2 Well, I didn't -- obviously before then I didn't know Α. 3 anything about that. Obviously it is brought up there 4 so, you know, the difficulty is that CCTV 5 cameras/equipment, it will break down, but, you know, it is getting up and running as quickly as possible, so --6 7 and especially in vehicles such as this that are attending calls, you would want -- from a public point 8 of view, but also from a police safety point of view, 9 10 you would want the cameras to be working, so it sounds like it hasn't been working for two months, but I have 11 12 no idea whether that was reported, where it was reported 13 to, you know, and what was done in terms of actually getting either that system repaired or a new system put 14 15 in, but, you know, somebody at the local office there 16 would know, or will know exactly what happened. Some witnesses have given evidence about CCTV and 17 Q. 18 indicated that it would be a prioritisation of 19 resources, but from what you're saying would you 20 consider CCTV recordings on a police vehicle such as 21 this to be a higher priority than perhaps in other 22 areas? 23 Well, I mean you take whatever is available to you, so

if the police vehicle's CCTV was available then you

would take it, as you would take CCTV from elsewhere.

1 I mean it's -- you know, it's independent in itself, it records what it records, I mean it's -- and, you know, 2 that would be a good starting point in terms of the 3 4 investigation, but unfortunately it's not been 5 available. So had it been available that would have been of 6 Q. 7 assistance to the investigation? Yes. If I can give you an example? 8 Α. Please do. 9 Q. 10 Α. I spoke yesterday about two shootings, police shootings, 11 one in the Gorbals in Glasgow and one outside -- at 12 Carfin railway station and when the initial response 13 went to the individual who was allegedly carrying a firearm, the helicopter was sent up to record the 14 15 situation. The person was shot and so the first thing to seize was the helicopter footage which portrayed the 16 whole scene, everything that had happened, and so that 17 18 was a really good starting point in terms of understanding how the shooting had taken place. 19 20 It would be the same with the CCTV in a vehicle, 21 you know, so if it records the whole incident and the 22 scene, then that's a really good starting point in understanding exactly what happened. 23 Would you also think that things like a body worn 24 Q. 25 camera --

24

25

Q.

1 Α. Yes. 2 -- would assist in an investigation into what had Q. 3 happened? Yes, it would and, you know, for years we have -- well, 4 Α. 5 so I don't know the situation now, I have been out of the organisation for seven years, but we looked on many 6 occasions at having body worn cameras. We had pilots 7 I think in Paisley and elsewhere but as -- like many 8 9 things, you need a lot of funding in terms of -- so it's 10 not just the camera itself, it's how you download it, how you support it, how you present it as evidence and 11 12 so -- but, you know, I don't know where we are in terms 13 of that now, but, yes, of course it would be helpful. We certainly know that there were no body worn 14 Q. 15 cameras --16 Α. No. -- in 2015. 17 Q. 18 Α. Yes. 19 But had that existed at the time, that would have been Q. 20 something you would have found helpful for the 21 investigation? Yes, it would be part of -- that would be part of the 22 Α. investigation. 23

Right. Can we look at item 5, which is further down the

page of these minutes. Thank you. This relates to

1 family concerns and I will read this out. I'm interested in your recollection of this discussion, so 2 3 Garry McEwan: "... discussed brother-in-law of deceased, he is 4 5 part of an independent advisory group and had advised the initial attending officers that he knew Mr McEwan 6 7 and requested that he attend and speak with him within 24 hours. 8 "[Chief Superintendent] and [Chief Inspector] 9 10 Shepherd attended at the home address of [next of kin], highly charged environment, deceased partner Colette and 11 12 extended family within, family concerned that early 13 contact they had was purposely vague. They were unhappy 14 they had not been told anything about who contacted 15 the police and ambulance. [Chief Superintendent] provided them with an understanding of events. [Chief 16 17 Superintendent] discussed the role of the PIRC and reassured them it would not be P Division officers 18 investigating the incident." 19 20 And the task there was identified as: 21 "Family crave reassurance and are asking about witnesses etc they do not wish anything publicised until 22 they inform deceased mother who is in London." 23 24 Do you remember this part of the discussion at this third Gold Group meeting? 25

- 1 A. Yes, so in general terms I do, yes.
- 2 Q. Can you tell us what your recollection was about the
- discussion that took place in relation to Garry McEwan's
- 4 visit to the family?
- 5 A. So I think that it is just -- it's an update to Gold
- 6 there to say that he had been asked to attend and that
- 7 they had, along with Nicola Shepherd, attended at
- 8 the home address, which he obviously described as
- 9 a "highly charged environment", and then he obviously
- 10 outlines there that he has discussed the role of the
- 11 PIRC and whatever else -- just whatever is contained in
- that paragraph. I wouldn't expect that there was much
- more discussion about it than giving us a brief on
- 14 exactly what happened.
- 15 Q. What's your recollection of the words that are used in
- the second paragraph, that the family were concerned
- that early contact they had was "purposely vague"?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Do you remember what that was about?
- 20 A. Well, I think they felt that they hadn't been given
- 21 enough information from the beginning.
- 22 Q. And what was your view about that? Did you have any
- concerns about this?
- A. Well, my view was, as I said before, that we ought to be
- 25 giving the information that we have and I can't remember

24

25

1 exactly what the detail of -- you know, what they felt that they weren't being told, but, you know, it's 2 3 incumbent on us, giving the family all the information 4 that they require. I think prior to this you gave evidence that in relation 5 Q. 6 to Collette Bell you thought she should have been told 7 about the death --A. Yes I think -- sorry. 8 -- after coming into contact with the police and there 9 Q. 10 was no reason why she shouldn't have been given that information. 11 12 No, exactly. Α. In principle is your view the same in relation to the 13 Q. 14 next of kin --15 Α. It is, absolutely. -- that they should have been given a full explanation 16 Q. and an honest explanation about what had happened? 17 Not -- yes, absolutely. 18 Α. 19 And then it says here there would be no P Division Q. 20 officers investigating the incident. Was that your 21 understanding? 22 Well, as we discussed yesterday, it will obviously --Α. sorry, P Division officers were on the ground 23

investigating, I mean we wouldn't really have any choice

in the initial stages of the enquiry, but I assume that

- 1 what he means from that is that at some stage it is
- 2 going to become a PIRC enquiry and P Division officers
- 3 wouldn't be involved in that aspect of it.
- Q. So once PIRC take over the investigation --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. -- the family were being told there would be no
- 7 P Division officers?
- 8 A. Well, so --
- 9 Q. Do you think that's accurate?
- 10 A. I wouldn't like to say that's 100% accurate because, as
- I said before, you know, the PIRC don't have hundreds of
- resources, they've got a number of people -- and I can't
- tell you the number now, but I probably knew it when
- I was in office, but -- so they have to work in a way
- that they will have an SIO and then they will ask us to
- support them in terms of some of the investigation, so
- it may well be that when they have asked us to, I don't
- 18 know, seize CCTV or carry out house-to-house inquiries,
- 19 or whatever, that P Division officers may well have been
- involved in that, so I don't know.
- 21 Q. I'm conscious of the time, so as with yesterday I think
- 22 if I could stop you there and I will ask the Chair if
- 23 now might be an appropriate time to adjourn. Thank you.
- I'm conscious of the time.
- 25 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. We will stop for lunch and sit

1 again at 2 o'clock. (1.00 pm)2 3 (The luncheon adjournment) 4 (2.00 pm)LORD BRACADALE: Good afternoon. I think we can revert to 5 the normal timetable this afternoon: have a break at 6 7 3 o'clock and then sit until quarter past 4. Carry on now please, Ms Grahame. 8 MS GRAHAME: Thank you very much. Just before lunch we were 9 10 talking about the minutes for the third Gold Group meeting. This was at 20.15 on 3 May and I wonder if we 11 12 could have those back on the screen, PS03139, and we 13 were talking about item 5 on the agenda, family 14 concerns, at the bottom of page 2. 15 A. Yes. Q. And I was also going to ask you about the final task 16 17 that is listed there: 18 "Family crave reassurance and are asking about witnesses etc they do not wish anything publicised until 19 20 they inform deceased Mother who is in London." 21 First of all, do you remember that part of the discussion at the Gold Group? 22 A. I don't really, but obviously it's in the minutes so 23 that's what was stated. 24 25 Q. Do you have any recollection about who would be expected

- 1 to complete that task? There's no name given next to
 2 it.
- 3 A. Well, I think that Gold and everybody else needs to take
- 4 cognisance -- the second part of it at the very least --
- 5 take cognisance of the fact that the family don't want
- anything publicised until they inform Mr Bayoh's mother,
- 7 so it's absolutely taking cognisance of that as the
- 8 family wish, that's what should happen.
- 9 Q. As Gold Commander would your expectation be that those
- 10 wishes would be complied with?
- 11 A. Yes, absolutely.
- 12 Q. Right. And do you remember anyone discussing Mr Bayoh's
- mother being in London, or arrangements that were being
- made by the family?
- 15 A. I do remember that she was elsewhere than in Kirkcaldy,
- but -- obviously I can see from this that she was in
- 17 London, but I don't remember that discussion in that
- great detail, no.
- 19 Q. And in terms of someone giving the family reassurance,
- who would be responsible for that task, in your
- 21 understanding of how things work who would you think
- 22 would deal with that task?
- 23 A. So -- well, the FLOs should -- they are engaged with the
- family so the FLO -- well, I'm not sure now obviously
- 25 whether the FLOs were actually engaged with the family

1 at that stage, so Garry McEwan has been to see the 2 family and presumably he is updating us that they want reassurance and are asking about witnesses, etc, and the 3 4 fact that they don't want anything publicised, so 5 I suppose my question now is: was sufficient reassurance provided in terms of what they're asking for and then 6 7 did we comply with it? That's the -- I don't know the answer to that at this moment in time. 8 Do you have any recollection --9 Q. 10 Α. No, I don't really. -- about the actions that were taken by the Gold Group 11 Q. 12 after this was raised? Well, I assume they're just about to come up, but not 13 Α. really, no. 14 15 Q. Let's move on to the next section, so this is page 3, and completing item 3, so you've got a complete picture 16 of what was under that heading -- 5, sorry: 17 18 "Discussed that Police did not know [next of kin] 19 whilst Colette (partner of deceased) was at Police 20 Station. 21 "[Chief Superintendent] discussing initial decision to have Police Scotland FLOs but now hand over to PIRC 22 FLOs for arrangement to gain entry to house of deceased 23 re collecting belongings for child. Discussion re 24 25 initial contact on phone from PIRC.

1 "[Chief Superintendent] discusses Family desperate to know about [post mortem], and also arrangements on 2 having them conveyed to mortuary in Edinburgh." 3 4 And then: "TASK -- To address all family issues raised." 5 So again that task, to address all family issues 6 7 raised, no one is allocated that task, or no named 8 person is? No, but my expectation would be that it would be from 9 10 Garry McEwan to the appropriate individuals, which would 11 involve family liaison officers if the family were to be 12 conveyed to Edinburgh, to the mortuary. We have heard evidence that Garry McEwan was concerned 13 Q. 14 about the fact that FLOs hadn't been deployed to the 15 family that day and as a result of his concerns, and the fact the family, Ade Johnson, brother-in-law of 16 17 Sheku Bayoh, had known him and asked for him to attend, that he went to the family home after 6 o'clock in the 18 19 evening. He explained that wasn't a normal thing that 20 he would do. 21 Α. Yes, that's correct, yes. 22 But in the particular circumstances he felt it was Q. appropriate. I'm summarising. 23 24 Α. Mm-hm.25 Q. So he has -- by the time of this Gold Group meeting he

- 1 has been to the family home, he is updating the 2 Gold Group in relation to that meeting.
- 3 A. That's right.
- Q. So in terms of the tasks that are identified under this
 item in the minutes, who would you expect to be dealing
 with these -- addressing the family issues that were
 raised?
- Well, so Garry McEwan was the person that was with the 8 Α. 9 family, had most knowledge, so I wouldn't expect himself 10 to be undertaking that but I would expect him to delegate it to other people and, as I said, you know, 11 12 well, there's a bit of confusion about whether the FLOs 13 were there or not, but ultimately that kind of information, conveying the family to the mortuary, ought 14 15 to be the duties of the FLOs.
- Q. And in terms of your own expectations as Gold Commander,
 what would you have expected to be happening in relation
 to the family issues that are raised, including the
 arrangements to go to the mortuary?
- A. Yes, well, they have asked to go to the mortuary,

 I don't think there was any reason that they shouldn't

 go to the mortuary, so they ought to be conveyed there.

 That would be the appropriate thing to do.
- Q. And from your perspective, what was the purpose of taking the family to the mortuary?

- A. Well, I mean it's not outlined there, but I assume it's about identification, so ...
- Q. And can you -- you mentioned an issue with the FLOs.

 Were you aware at this time that there was a lot of

 discussion going on about the FLOs and Garry McEwan has

 given evidence that he was concerned about the FLOs and

 that no one had actually gone to see the next of kin?
- Yes, I mean I think we discussed that yesterday at some 8 Α. 9 point in terms of the length of time it took to get FLOs 10 deployed and that's absolutely right. So at this point 11 then, you know, he has been to see the family, we're 12 trying to understand exactly what the issues are and 13 we're tasking him in the first instance to delegate 14 people to undertake the various roles that are 15 identified there, including taking the family to the 16 mortuary.
- Q. To go back to the previous page, the information that
 the mother was in London and the family didn't wish
 anything to be publicised until they had had
 an opportunity to inform her, do you have a recollection
 of being told that the mother was going to travel up
 from London up to Scotland?
- A. I don't at this stage, but I probably was told. I was
 probably told as part of this here, that the family
 didn't want publicity until the mother was informed in

- 1 London, and probably as part of that discussion I was
- 2 told that the mother was -- intended to attend in
- 3 Kirkcaldy, but I can't specifically remember.
- 4 Q. From your perspective would that be a reasonable request
- 5 for the family to make, not to publicise things until
- 6 they have informed his mother when she returned -- came
- 7 up?
- 8 A. Of course, yes, exactly.
- 9 Q. We have heard evidence from Kadi, she gave evidence to
- 10 the Inquiry -- this is Sheku Bayoh's sister,
- 11 Kadi Johnson -- on Day 34 of the Inquiry, 31 January,
- 12 that they very quickly made -- looked online for flights
- for the mother to come and travel up from London and
- 14 that the intention was she would get to Edinburgh about
- 2.00 or 3.00 in the afternoon on the Monday, 4 May. She
- gave evidence that Sheku Bayoh's mother would be
- 17 travelling up the next day, they made that clear and
- they were willing to identify the body once she arrived
- 19 in Scotland. Again, is that a reasonable approach for
- the family to take?
- 21 A. Yes, I would think so.
- 22 Q. And from a Police Scotland perspective can you envisage
- any reasons why that request could not be complied with?
- A. No, not at all.
- 25 Q. We have heard that the body is really in the charge of

- 1 the -- in the custody of the Crown.
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. And it is for them to organise the post mortem.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Can you envisage any hindrances to this request being
- 6 complied with?
- 7 A. No, I can't and I think the post mortem was to be held
- 8 on Monday afternoon anyway, so ...
- 9 Q. So if it was to be delayed, it wouldn't be delayed by
- 10 much?
- 11 A. No, not at all.
- 12 Q. We have heard evidence that the mother actually did fly
- up the following day to Edinburgh, so arrived in
- 14 Edinburgh initially. Can you see any reason why the
- post mortem couldn't have been delayed even slightly to
- 16 allow identification?
- 17 A. Well, you know, I can't but I don't organise the
- post mortems, so it might be -- well, I'm now going to
- 19 suppose and that's the wrong thing to do, so I don't --
- I don't know.
- 21 Q. Is it a request that you would have felt in any way
- 22 uncomfortable about making of the Crown or the
- 23 pathologist?
- A. No, not at all.
- 25 Q. Can I ask you in terms of the post mortem, by that stage

- on the Monday would that have been something that
 the police were still involved in progressing, or was
- 3 that already at the stage of PIRC having taken over? Do
- 4 you have a view on that?
- 5 A. Well, I don't think that PIRC had fully taken over the
- 6 enquiry by the Monday. I think it was into the Tuesday
- before they were fully engaged with the enquiry, so at
- 8 this stage -- and you know, other people will be able to
- 9 give you more detail about who was at the post mortem
- and, you know, who was between the two, the SIO -- our
- 11 SIO, the Police Scotland SIO anyway and the PIRC,
- 12 you know, how much of a handover had taken place by the
- 13 time that the post mortem was taking place.
- Q. Did you have a clear view at that time about whether it
- 15 was Police Scotland that were making progress in
- 16 relation to the post mortem and arrangements, or PIRC,
- or did you not have a clear view about that?
- 18 A. No, I didn't have a clear view at that stage.
- 19 Q. So as Gold Commander would you have been in a position
- 20 to provide that strategic direction if you had been
- invited to do so?
- 22 A. In terms of who was in charge of the ...?
- 23 Q. The post mortem, making arrangements with the family,
- 24 that type of thing.
- 25 A. Well, I think that -- yes, of course if there was an

1 issue with that but, you know, as I said before, it's about the Police Service continuing with the 2 3 investigation until the PIRC is in a position to take 4 over that investigation, so I'm not sure at that point 5 whether the PIRC had enough staff and resource to be 6 able to take over the investigation, so I assume on the 7 Monday -- so Sunday being day one, Monday would be that point that we would be trying to reposition so that the 8 PIRC was the lead organisation, but I'm not sure 9 10 whether, you know, they were in a position to do that on 11 the Monday or not. 12 Q. I will come back to the question of resourcing actually, 13 but before we leave this item on the agenda, can I go 14 back to the comment about the family being concerned 15 that early contact they had was "purposely vague", we mentioned that earlier just before lunch. 16 We have heard evidence from Kadi in relation to the 17 delivery of the death message, and I appreciate you 18 19 weren't present at that, but I wonder if I can read out 20 a passage of evidence that we have heard from Kadi and 21 ask you for some comments on that please. So if you can 22 just give me a moment. (Pause). So Kadi Johnson gave evidence, as I have said, on 23 Day 34, 31 January and for those behind me this is 24

line 37 of the transcript. She says -- and this comes

25

1 from her Inquiry statement which she spoke to: "I feel it was appalling the way we were treated 2 because how can you come and deliver such information 3 4 when you know that the very first question is 'how did 5 my loved one die?' and yet you couldn't tell us. Why did they feel that they can come to our house to deliver 6 7 such information without knowing the proper answer, or why did they decide to just tell us whatever they want 8 to say to us and they thought that we will go with it, 9 or we will just believe it." 10 She -- I asked her to compare her experiences with 11 12 her role in healthcare. She explained she works as 13 a nurse, or did at the time and she said: 14 "Answer: Well, for me there was no compassion. They 15 just came, they told me the news. Yes, they were calm 16 but I didn't feel no compassion because if you're 17 delivering such information you should have the right 18 words to tell me, you should have the true words to tell 19 me, but that wasn't expressed to me. So for me there 20 was no compassion. They just came, they did their job 21 and just told me the news." 22 Now, listening to that passage of evidence I wonder if you have any concerns about the way the family were 23 treated on 3 May, if you would like to --24 Well, the family ought to be, as I have said many times, 25

treated with fairness and respect. They ought to be given whatever information it is that we have that we can provide to them, but -- and the family ought to feel that officers that attend are compassionate in terms of what's happened. And if that's not what's happened I can only apologise, but I don't represent the organisation any more, so~... But these things should never happen.

Q. Thank you.

Can we for the moment go right back to the top of these minutes because these are the minutes from the Gold Group meeting at the end of this day and we have heard from Garry McEwan about the way things had progressed by the evening on 3 May and we have heard about his visit to the family and a moment ago you talked about the word "resources" and I would quite like to ask you about that.

We have heard some -- we have heard evidence from Pat Campbell about issues that he had. Now, he gave evidence on Day 47 and expressed reservations about handing over the investigation to PIRC due to their resourcing. He had concerns about their capacity to respond to such a significant incident, he didn't know when they would arrive and he didn't know what resources they would have when they did arrive.

1 Resources wise, he gave evidence that his investigation had about 20 or 22 resources from 2 3 Police Scotland -- I think that's officers -- and PIRC 4 turn up with four or five. This was the first 5 deployment of PIRC and it was a challenge and he was reluctant to relinquish control of the incident and had 6 7 a bit of trepidation and he questioned whether it would have set the investigation back if they gave the 8 9 handover to PIRC. 10 I'm interested in your views on those comments from 11 Pat Campbell. 12 Well, he doesn't have any choice but to relinquish 13 control. It's a PIRC-led investigation and he has to 14 hand over to PIRC as quickly as possible. PIRC will 15 make the decisions about how many resources that they've got there. We can't second judge the PIRC because four 16 17 or five officers turn up at Kirkcaldy office. You only 18 need one strong leader to actually direct what's going 19 on, asking -- they can direct Police Scotland and use 20 the 22 resources that we've got, or 17,000 that we've 21 got across the force area if that's what is asked of us. 22 So, you know, we ought to just get on with what our job is and allow the PIRC to get on with what their job 23 is. What the resourcing is, how they set themselves up 24 is entirely for them. From a $\operatorname{--}$ I have said this a few 25

1 times: we need an independent enquiry and if that's initially started by four or five officers, well, so be 2 3 it, but they can ask us to carry out -- "We want you to 4 carry out these house-to-house, we want you to seize 5 this CCTV", that can still be independent. We can just go and take the CCTV and we hand it over to them or we 6 7 secure it so it is available to them. So I don't think what their resources are, you know, that we should be 8 9 starting to worry too much about that. We ought to be 10 doing what we should be doing: carrying out the investigation, stabilising everything, securing 11 12 everything and then being in a position to be able to 13 hand over to the PIRC. Every single investigation 14 wouldn't be carried out for them, it can't be. They're 15 never going to have the resources that Police Scotland has got to undertake an investigation. That doesn't 16 mean to say they can't carry out that investigation. 17 18 Thank you. Can I ask you at this meeting -- you will Q. 19 see the list of names of who are present. We have other 20 information available to the Inquiry that a Gill Boulton 21 addressed or spoke at a Gold Group meeting, this 22 Gold Group meeting: "... to confirm that FLOs would be key in obtaining 23 information, to allow reassurance messages or strategy 24 25 to be developed and would be recorded within the

Community Impact Assessment." 1 Now, first of all, can I ask do you remember 2 3 a Gill Boulton addressing the Gold Group meeting? 4 Α. So I can't specifically but Gill Boulton had a role in 5 terms of equality and diversity so I'm not surprised that we would have asked for a briefing from her to make 6 7 sure that we understood all the issues in terms of that. It should have been recorded on whichever Gold Group 8 9 meeting it is and that's an oversight and I should have 10 challenged that. But anyway, it doesn't surprise me in 11 the slightest. 12 Q. So there's nothing unusual about the Gold Group inviting 13 someone to come and address them or brief them on a particular topic? 14 15 Α. No. If it's a really important issue then, as I say, 16 she had a role at the training centre in terms of 17 diversity, equality and diversity, so it was important to make sure we were up-to-date with all the various 18 19 facets of that and she would be -- you know, she could 20 ask and challenge any decisions or any actions that were 21 being taken and to rectify any situation that we were 22 involved in, so ... Right. And in light of the fact you don't actually 23 Q. remember Gill Boulton being present, presumably you 24 don't have any recollection of what happened in response 25

1 to any briefing she may have given? 2 No, I don't. Α. Looking back now, at this -- where things were in the 3 Q. 4 evening on 3 May, do you think the Gold Group could have 5 done more, or developed further strategies in relation to delivering messages to the community? 6 7 We can always do more, there's no question about that, Α. and we can't do enough in terms of communities, but 8 I would hope from what we did that there was sufficient 9 10 there to actually go and engage with the community, deal with the issues that were highlighted from the 11 12 Gold Group meeting and take -- you know, take that 13 forward. Could the Gold Group do more? Could I have 14 done more? Well, no doubt I could and no doubt the 15 Gold Group could. As I say, we can always do more but I hope that what we did was sufficient at that time. 16 But, you know, we will no doubt learn. 17 Thank you. Can I ask you to look at item 2, which is on 18 Q. 19 page 2, top of page 2. This is factual update given by 20 Pat Campbell. It says: 21 "Information to suggest that the deceased had an 22 argument with his partner Collette Bell." And we have heard evidence from Collette Bell that 23 when her statement was taken at Kirkcaldy Police Office 24 25 the police were I think quite insistent in relation to

- 1 asking about whether there had been an argument. She 2 made it very clear to the Inquiry there was no argument, 3 but she I think felt -- if I can summarise by saying 4 felt under a little pressure in terms of that line of 5 questioning. Can you help us understand why this topic 6 would be raised in the evening of 3 May at the 7 Gold Group meeting? Well, so obviously Pat Campbell felt that it was 8 Α. 9 pertinent in terms of what was happening, so, you know, 10 the fact that Collette Bell was the partner, it was really important, so it was updating the Gold Group in 11 12 terms of potentially the sensitivities roundabout, 13 you know, what was being undertaken there. Can you help us understand which hypothesis would this 14 Q. 15 assist with or be relevant to? Well, so obviously it's looking at the previous history 16 Α. 17 and, you know, what may have led to the cause of death, 18 but, you know, in terms of it being merely an argument
- and, you know, what may have led to the cause of death,

 but, you know, in terms of it being merely an argument

 it is unlikely to have contributed so -- but, you know,

 that was an update from Pat Campbell that that's what

 was being undertaken, so I don't know the detail on

 that. You would need to ask Pat where that -- you have

 anyway, but where that fitted into his -- which

 hypothesis that fitted into.
 - Q. Having heard from Collette Bell herself, she has

25

death?

line.

- expressed the view that she felt there was an attempt to
 find reasons to blame Sheku Bayoh for his own death and
 to raise concerns about relationships that he had with
 his family, including Collette Bell. Was there any
 attempt or mindset to blame Sheku Bayoh for his own
- 7 Α. Well, not from a Gold perspective there definitely wasn't, but, as I said before, I mean it's not taking 8 9 any particular course of action or -- but to, you know, 10 follow the evidence, follow the evidence wherever it takes you, gather all the evidence that you possibly can 11 12 and then you can make decisions. But, you know, what 13 you shouldn't do at any stage is try to blame someone. 14 You need to wait for the evidence, that's the bottom
- 16 Q. Thank you. Can we move on to the next Gold Group

 17 meeting, which was the next day, PS03161, and this is at

 18 12.30 on 4 May 2015, so the day after Mr Bayoh died,

 19 roundabout lunchtime.
- 20 A. Yes.

6

15

Q. We have looked at these before. This is an agenda.

There's no -- it is also minutes, but there's no list of

who was present at the meeting. Now, it has been

suggested that you were present at the meeting and your

name is next to the Terms of Reference. Were you

1

present at this meeting?

I was, yes. 2 Α. You were. And this was at Kirkcaldy Police Station. 3 Q. 4 Α. Yes, it was. 5 And do you remember attending this Gold Group meeting? Q. 6 Well, I remember attending the various Gold Group Α. 7 meetings, yes. Q. Can we look please at page 2, so this relates to item 3 8 9 on the agenda which is the investigative process. This 10 was spoken to by a DI Stuart Wilson. Page 2 and around -- yes, it's actually at the bottom of the screen 11 12 as we look add it. You see the items listed "TASK" and 13 the first of those says: 14 "TASK -- Advice to be gained from PIRC regarding the 15 disclosure of the PM results to the Officers involved in 16 the incident. Supervisor to be identified to carry this 17 disclosure out." 18 And I'm interested in your recollection of this part 19 of the meeting. Tell us what you remember? Well, I think that potentially Garry McEwan wanted the 20 Α. 21 officers informed of the PM results and -- however, it 22 was important that advice was gained from the PIRC at that stage to make sure that that wasn't going to have 23 any detrimental effect on their investigation and if it 24 wasn't and it was appropriate to disclose the ${\tt PM}$ 25

- 1 results, then that should be carried out by
- 2 a supervisor.
- 3 Q. Do you have any recollection of who the supervisor was
- 4 to be identified?
- 5 A. No, I -- no.
- 6 Q. So your recollection is it was Garry McEwan that wanted
- 7 the officers informed?
- 8 A. I'm pretty sure it was, yes.
- 9 Q. Do you remember his reasons for wanting the officers
- 10 informed?
- 11 A. Well, it was probably -- so I think it was in relation
- 12 to -- sorry, giving the officers an update on the
- position and where the investigation was.
- 14 Q. We have heard some evidence that the officers were not
- willing to give statements without information on the
- post mortem results. Do you remember that being
- 17 discussed?
- 18 A. Well, the officers definitely weren't prepared to give
- 19 statements. I don't recollect any discussion about it
- 20 being until either they got legal advice or they knew of
- 21 the post mortem results.
- 22 Q. You don't remember any comment of that being made?
- 23 A. No, no.
- Q. What would your view be about any suggestion that they
- 25 wanted these results before they would give statements?

- 1 Α. Well, that's -- well, they should give operational statements without any of that. In terms of the 2 3 subsequent interviews and statements then it may well be 4 that you would want to disclose -- it would be -- that 5 would be part of the interview strategy, but it may well be that you would want to disclose parts of the 6 7 post mortem result if that -- you know, if that was important in terms of your interview strategy. But 8 9 I don't think that it is appropriate for officers in the 10 first instance to be saying that they're not going to give any statements until they have the results of the 11 12 post mortem.
- Q. And why do you say you don't think it's appropriate for officers to be saying that?
- 15 A. Well, you know, they're obliged to give -- it is

 16 incumbent on them to give operational statements and

 17 these statements ought to be given long before

 18 a post mortem is carried out.
- 19 Q. Before lunch you talked about -- we talked about the
 20 hypotheses and the race hypothesis, as I was calling it,
 21 and you explained that the investigation couldn't
 22 exclude a race hypothesis without the statements of the
 23 officers.
- 24 A. Mm-hm.
- 25 Q. That would be an important part of the evidence

information?

1 gathering.

8

- 2 A. It would, yes.
- Q. And yesterday we talked about conferral and avoiding
 that because it could have an impact on statements. Was
 there any part of this discussion where that aspect was
 addressed, that perhaps you would have wanted the
 statements from the officers prior to giving them any
- A. No, I mean as far as I was concerned they were refusing
 to give statements and so this was a request at the
 Gold Group meeting to provide information regarding the
 post mortem, and so it is pushed -- you know, is it
 appropriate and can we have advice from the PIRC in
 terms of their view of providing information in relation
 to the post mortem.
- Q. Did you or anyone else at the Gold Group express

 concerns that giving officers information about the

 post mortem results before their statements have been

 obtained might not be the best idea?
- 20 A. Well, yes, but the outcome of the post mortem was

 "unascertained" so it really doesn't provide much

 information to, you know, the officers or anybody else.

 It tells everybody that there's more information to be

 gained, there's more investigation to be carried out, so

 from that perspective it probably doesn't make much

- difference in terms of knowing that information.
- 2 Q. But when this meeting was going on at 12.30 on 4 May,
- 3 the post mortem hadn't been conducted at that stage.
- 4 A. Right.
- 5 Q. And the initial post mortem report was available
- 6 two days later.
- 7 A. Right.
- 8 Q. So I think at the top -- tell me if we're wrong --
- 9 A. No, sorry.
- 10 Q. -- but at the top of the minutes we see that it should
- 11 say 12.30 I think on 4 May.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. So as I understand the evidence --
- 14 A. Sorry, yes.
- 15 Q. -- there wouldn't have been any information available to
- 16 you at that time?
- 17 A. So there's no information available. Yes, okay, so
- there's no information available at that time, sorry.
- 19 Q. And so in a situation where there's no statements, no
- use of force forms, no use of spray forms and the
- 21 post mortem will be conducted later the same day and
- 22 there's a discussion about giving officers information
- about the post mortem, I'm just wondering now in
- 24 hindsight do you have concerns about that request to
- 25 give the officers information?

- 1 A. Yes. So at that point there was no information to give
- 2 in any event, so I assume then it's a case of speaking
- 3 to the PIRC and understanding what information it is
- 4 that ought to be given to the officers. But fairly
- 5 obviously we wouldn't find that out until later on when
- the post mortem was actually held, so ...
- 7 Q. And do you know who took that -- if we go back to that
- 8 task, "Advice to be gained from PIRC", who took that
- 9 task forward? Sorry, this is on page 2 at the task we
- 10 looked at before just -- there we are, it's on the
- 11 screen.
- 12 A. No, I'm not --
- Q. Do you know who took that task forward?
- 14 A. I don't.
- Q. So this item on the agenda, "Investigative process",
- item 3, was spoken to by DI Stuart Wilson. Would it
- have been DI Stuart Wilson that would have taken that
- task forward, or would it have been PIRC? Well, someone
- 19 had to speak to PIRC.
- 20 A. Someone had to speak to PIRC, so I assume you would need
- 21 to speak to him to understand whether in fact he did
- 22 contact PIRC in relation to this.
- 23 Q. Were you given any updates after this Gold Group meeting
- about what the advice from PIRC was, if any?
- 25 A. I don't recollect that.

- 1 Q. Did anyone come back to you as Gold Commander to sign
- 2 off on releasing this information to officers?
- 3 A. I don't think so and I -- well, I don't remember but
 4 I don't think so.
- 5 Q. Would you have expected to be addressed or briefed on 6 this matter?
- A. No, I think that, back to what I said previously, I mean it was a case of a discussion with the PIRC and understanding exactly what was to be disclosed and then making that disclosure, or whether it was appropriate to make that disclosure.
- Q. But ultimately when it says, "Advice to be gained from PIRC", would it have been PIRC that took the ultimate decision?
- 15 A. Well, at that point it's their investigation so,

 16 you know, they know and understand what it is that they

 17 want to glean from the officers and whether it's

 18 appropriate to disclose the PM results or not.
- 19 Q. Thank you. We have heard evidence that the family -- we
 20 have looked at the previous minutes about them being
 21 desperate to know about the post mortem and we have
 22 heard evidence that the family did not know that
 23 a post mortem had been carried out until the Tuesday,
 24 5 May, so the day after, after a meeting with their
 25 solicitor. Does it concern you -- we have also heard

1 evidence that the officers were given information about 2 post mortem results on the evening of 4 May. Does it 3 concern you that the family weren't told that 4 a post mortem had even taken place until after the 5 police officers? It absolutely does. 6 Α. 7 Q. And why does that concern you? Well, the family should have been informed first. 8 Α. We have heard other evidence that the family should have 9 Q. 10 been the priority --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- in terms of sharing that information and they should 13 have been told first. They should. 14 Α. 15 Who would have been responsible for sharing that Q. information with the family about post mortem results? 16 Well, it should be the FLOs and that would be the normal 17 Α. 18 course of events, but ... 19 Would that be the PIRC FLOs or the Police --Q. Well, it depends who was engaged -- sorry, it depends 20 Α.

and also telling them the results.

who was engaged with the family at that time. I can't

that time, but whoever was engaged with the family ought

to have been telling the family about the post mortem

recollect which FLOs were engaged with the family at

21

22

23

24

- 1 Q. And who is responsible for the FLOs?
- 2 A. Well, ultimately the SIO.
- 3 Q. So if it's Police Scotland it would be someone like
- 4 Pat Campbell?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And if it is PIRC it would be whoever the equivalent of
- 7 Pat Campbell would be?
- 8 A. That's right, that's right, that's right.
- 9 Q. Depending on the point of handover?
- 10 A. That's right.
- 11 Q. We spoke previously about Mr William or Billy Little and
- 12 you mentioned him in your evidence. Could we perhaps
- look at your Inquiry statement please.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. I'm interested in paragraph 296. Thank you. The
- 16 Inquiry team asked you to -- you say you:
- "... have been told William Little of PIRC
- states ... the following ..."
- 19 So this is a PIRC statement from Billy Little and
- 20 you were allowed to look at -- asked to look at that and
- 21 were asked questions.
- 22 A. Correct.
- Q. So let's just look at 296 and it says:
- 24 "About 12.35 hours same date whilst en route to
- 25 Edinburgh City Mortuary [this is Billy Little], I was

1 contacted by [ACC Nicolson] ... During this telephone call Mr Nicolson indicated that he had some concerns 2 3 regarding the handover of the investigation from 4 Police Scotland to the PIRC, in particular it could be 5 viewed that Police Scotland were still dealing with this incident. I advised him that I had been in contact with 6 7 Detective Superintendent Campbell and arrangements were being made for the handover in line with the terms of 8 9 reference. I also assured him that Mr Campbell was 10 fully aware that the PIRC were the sole investigators of the interaction between the deceased and the police." 11 12 So this relates to a conversation that you had with 13 Mr Little. Can we look at the next paragraph please, 14 297. This is you now speaking in response: 15 "I'm not denying the conversation took place. The Gold meeting was 12.30 pm. The call might have been 16 17 12.25 pm or whatever. I do remember that call. His statement jogged my memory. It's straightforward, it's 18 obvious that I had concerns. I thought 19 20 [Police Scotland] were involved in too many aspects and 21 I wanted reassurance that PIRC were leading the enquiry 22 and that they were dictating what elements they were going to undertake and what Police Scotland were going 23 to undertake. I think I was reassured that that's what 24 I wanted to hear." 25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Can you tell us a little more about these concerns
that you had?

- Well, I just felt from a Police Scotland perspective Α. that we were still -- you know, from the information that I was gleaning, that we were still involved in many aspects of the enquiry. Now, of course that might be fine as long as the PIRC have an understanding of what enquiries they want to be involved in and what enquiries Police Scotland are involved in. So purely and simply at that stage -- and I assume that I have made the call before the Gold Group meeting to understand exactly what was happening and to provide myself with reassurance that, you know, the PIRC were leading on the enquiry and that they were undertaking the elements that they wanted to undertake, just like I have said in my statement there, and so he told me that -- well, as it says in my statement there, he had reassurance -- you know, it says in his that he was able to reassure me that they were involved with the investigation to the -- you know, to the extent that they believed that they ought to have been, so ...
 - Q. Let's just look at that previous paragraph. I'm sorry we can't get everything on this screen, but we see there that he says about 12.35 there is this call and you had expressed concerns:

"I advised him that I had been in contact with ... 1 Campbell and arrangements were being made for the 2 3 handover in line with the terms of reference. I also 4 assured him that Mr Campbell was fully aware that PIRC 5 were the sole investigators ..." So reading that, had there been a handover -- had 6 7 there been a handover because what this says is: "... arrangements were being made for the 8 handover~..." 9 10 Had there actually been a handover prior to this fourth Gold Group --11 12 A. From that it certainly doesn't feel like it and 13 I suppose that being on the ground it didn't feel like there was a full handover. Now, of course the PIRC were 14 15 there to some extent and, as I have said already, you know, it's not about the numbers that they have on 16 17 the ground, it's about leadership and just speaking to 18 the people who are leading at that time. So I assume that Billy Little -- I don't know if it he was SIO at 19 20 that stage, but obviously I was given his details so 21 I contacted him to give myself reassurance that we were 22 on the right track in terms of who is carrying out this investigation because, as I said before, the earlier --23 the sooner the PIRC are involved carrying out the 24 investigation, the better. 25

- Q. Did it -- it clearly concerned you. Were you surprised that there hadn't been a handover by 12.30, the fourth Gold Group meeting, on 4 May?

 A. Well, it depends when the handover -- so when -- if you
 - A. Well, it depends when the handover -- so when -- if you go back to 3 May when they arrived, and so I had a meeting -- so I think I had scheduled -- from the first Gold Group meeting I think I had scheduled a meeting for later in the afternoon but I brought it forward because they arrived, so I was -- I wanted them to be there so that they knew and understood exactly what was going on, so that they had all the information at a strategic level that I had and then they could go and speak to the SIO and sort out between the PIRC and the SIO exactly how that was being taken forward.

That's what I believed was happening from the afternoon of the Sunday, but then, you know, I've got to be careful -- I've got to be careful because Police Scotland has a lot of police officers and a lot of investigators so we could and we would, if we had an investigation, apply as many officers as we wanted.

I don't suppose that's entirely right, but -- so we could apply a lot of resource, so it was I suppose a bit more sluggish than what it would be if it was a purely Police Scotland enquiry. But, you know, there's an expectation that there would be a handover and that the

- 1 PIRC would be involved at the earliest stage that they
- 2 could become involved and that they could -- they had
- 3 enough resource to be able to take it forward in the way
- 4 that they wanted to take it forward.
- 5 Q. Thank you. So let me just go through some of that
- further. I think when we looked at the first Gold Group
- 7 minutes there was an entry at the end that said the next
- 8 meeting will be at 4 o'clock?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. But then when we looked at the second Gold Group meeting
- minutes they were at 14.40, is that -- you brought it
- forward because I think you also said PIRC had arrived
- by then.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. They were in Kirkcaldy by the second Gold Group meeting
- at 14.40 and they attended that meeting.
- 17 A. That's correct.
- 18 Q. So was your expectation that that would be the point at
- 19 which there was a handover to PIRC, once they were in
- the building and present?
- 21 A. Well, it would be -- I mean, it's a transition rather
- 22 than, you know, as you would understand it that I would
- 23 come over and put a folder and hand it over to you,
- I mean that isn't going to happen. So there's a whole
- load of enquiries ongoing, so it's a transition from

when they have it -- sorry, from when we have it initially to when they take it over, so that could take a couple of days, but you would expect on day two, the Monday, to see considerable activity and then on day two and then day three, even more activity and so as their activity escalates, our activity ought to de-escalate, so we're less involved. I would expect to see less of our people being involved in it and more of their people.

But of course, you know, if they're asking us to carry out some of the investigation then, you know, that might be a slower process because if they ask us to seize CCTV, if they ask us to do house-to-house enquiries, then on it goes. That actually might go on for a couple of weeks before we actually carry out all the house-to-house enquiries, before we seize the CCTV, but I would expect -- I don't know, but I would expect them to be carrying out the house-to-house enquiries in close proximity to the actual incident and then it would be a decision about us seizing the CCTV. So it might be us that did that because we were -- could be worried that it would get destroyed, be written over, depends on, you know, house CCTV might not last that long.

So it would be a transition in terms of from our point of view to their point of view, and that's not any

- different to where we were in the past with an outside
 force taking over. It would take a number of days for
 that handover to take place. But -- yes, sorry.

 Q. Is it fair to say you would have expected leadership to
- 5 have been demonstrated by PIRC from an early stage?
- 6 A. Yes.
- Q. Even though Police Scotland would still be supporting that investigation perhaps?
- A. All you need is one strong leader and then they can
 orchestrate, you know, what's going on. So they ask us,
 they can sit with our SIO, they can tell the SIO what
 they want, the SIO will delegate that down to whoever,
 or they can instruct their people. There's no
 difficulty with that whatsoever.
- Q. So looking back now you have mentioned one strong
 leader. Do you feel that that's what was provided by
 PIRC at the time?
- 18 A. Well, I think the leadership changed unfortunately over 19 that period of time, so --
- Q. Tell us about that.
- A. Well, I think it was Keith Harrower at the beginning and
 I think -- well, and it's Billy Little at that point.

 Now, I don't know the reason for that and actually that
 might not have detracted, I just don't know is the truth
 of the matter, but I would have just liked to have seen

25

```
1
             continuity and feet on the ground.
            We have heard in relation to Police Scotland that it's
 2
         Q.
             better not to change SIOs, it's better to have one SIO
 3
 4
             dealing with an investigation --
 5
         Α.
             Yes.
             -- and have that continuity there. Is that something
 6
         Q.
 7
             you would have liked to have seen with PIRC?
             Yes. Well, it -- you know, the PIRC wouldn't be any
 8
         Α.
 9
             different to Police Scotland. There will be reasons,
10
             so, you know, we had Pat Campbell, but we might have
             found that Pat Campbell was going on holiday in
11
12
             five days or whatever and we would have to change. The
13
             PIRC might be exactly the same. But would I like
             continuity? Absolutely. It's absolutely the best way
14
15
             to carry out an investigation of this scale.
16
             And can you explain to the Chair how does that -- you
         Q.
             have said it's the best way to carry out an
17
             investigation of this scale. How does that make it
18
19
             better or -- why is that the case?
20
             Well, because it's really difficult to articulate every
         Α.
21
             single aspect of the enquiry to another individual and
22
             for that person -- especially if it's at scale. If it's
             a very small enquiry then it's probably not
23
             a difficulty, but with the various aspects that there
24
```

are to this enquiry, there will be nuances all over the

- place that the SIO will pick up from day one and all the
 way through the enquiry. Trying to hand that over to
 someone else just makes it really difficult, so
 continuity is really important. I mean, you can manage
 that with a deputy SIO, so SIO and deputy SIO and then
 if the SIO has to change over, at least the deputy will
- 7 be able to have that continuity, or provide that
- 8 continuity, so ...
- 9 Q. So can things get lost --
- 10 A. Oh, yes.
- 11 Q. -- in the transition?
- 12 A. Yes. Well, that would be the worry. Whether it
 13 actually does or not, but it would be a worry that
 14 that's what happens.
- Q. And in this particular scenario we had a handover from

 Pat Campbell to Keith Harrower and then to Billy Little.
- A. Well, it feels like we were in a transition where

 Pat Campbell was the continuity from beginning through,

 but then we had Keith Harrower at the initial briefing

 and then transitioning through to Billy Little on

 day three I think, day two or day three.
- Q. This conversation that's described is on 4 May which is the Monday.
- A. Monday, yes.
- 25 Q. And it's around about 12.30, roundabout the time of the

24

25

fourth Gold Group meeting. 1 2 Α. Yes. Now, in relation to the minutes of this fourth 3 Q. 4 Gold Group meeting I wonder if we can go back to those. 5 This is the PS03161. I said to you at the outset 6 there's no list of who is present. 7 Α. Yes. Q. But we see some names mentioned after each item, so you 8 9 are named, Gold Strategy, DI Stuart Wilson is named, and 10 DI Stuart Wilson is named at 3. McEwan is named. 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. Shepherd is named. 13 Mm-hm. Α. 14 Q. And Conrad Trickett and Alan Seath are named, and again 15 Shepherd. I think after that it just says "All" as part of the discussion so perhaps no particular individual 16 17 was addressing it. 18 I asked previous witnesses were PIRC actually at 19 this meeting? I don't think they were but I don't know and obviously 20 Α. 21 there should have been a list of attendees. My practice 22 always was to go round the table and each person to identify themselves. It looks like whoever was taking 23

the minutes has decided they would write the officer's

name besides the heading and of course that's not the

- 1 best because there may have been people there that
- 2 haven't spoken, so -- but I would expect that there was
- a full list of attendees at some stage in terms of the
- 4 actual meeting itself.
- 5 Q. But your recollection now is that PIRC weren't --
- 6 A. I can't remember PIRC being there and I don't think
- 7 I would have been phoning Billy Little on his road
- 8 presumably to the post mortem then if they were in
- 9 attendance at the meeting.
- 10 Q. Right. Certainly that was what he said, he was I think
- 11 en route to the mortuary.
- 12 A. To the mortuary, yes.
- Q. So if there had been anyone from PIRC there would you
- 14 probably have discussed matters with them at the meeting
- instead of phoning Billy Little?
- 16 A. Yes, I would.
- Q. Looking back now, was this something that added to your
- 18 concerns? There was mention of -- I think you said in
- 19 your Inquiry statement there were too many aspects that
- 20 were causing you concern and you said you had expected
- 21 to see more activity from PIRC. Was this something else
- 22 that added to your concerns, the fact that no one from
- 23 PIRC was actually at this Gold Group meeting?
- A. Well, I mean that was part of, you know, I suppose that
- 25 I'm sitting at a strategic level, but you will get

1 a feel -- in terms of the PIRC you want to feel that 2 that, you know, you're -- you have to answer questions 3 that you're -- there's a bit of pain in terms of having 4 to provide what it is that you're having to provide and 5 making sure that you support everything that they're doing, so -- and I just didn't have that feeling that 6 7 there was -- the demands that I thought that we should have -- not, not -- at the end of the day, the PIRC are 8 9 carrying out the investigation and so from my 10 perspective, sorry, it's a real fine balance of being intrusive and feeling that we're -- I'm putting pressure 11 12 on anyone in the PIRC in any way whatsoever. So 13 I absolutely don't want anybody to feel that, you know, 14 during any discussion that that's what it's about. It's 15 about just reassurance from our perspective that -- from the Police Scotland perspective anyway, that the 16 17 investigation is progressing and it's progressing in the 18 way that the PIRC wants it to progress and that we 19 aren't overstepping the mark in terms of what it is that 20 they would want to undertake, so it's about having that 21 control of everything that's going on. 22 So I think the word you used earlier was "sluggish", you Q. felt the response from PIRC or their actions were more 23 sluggish and more so than a police enquiry would have 24 25 been at this stage?

1 A. Yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2 Q. Is that your recollection?
- Yes, but I did caveat that by saying that the number of 3 Α. 4 resources that we've got -- the PIRC could never have 5 the number of resources that we have. If they had the resources that were able to carry out every single 6 7 enquiry in terms of this, most of the year they would be sitting in an office somewhere in it East Kilbride with 8 9 nothing to do. That's just not value for money, so --10 but they need to have enough resource that they can undertake this enquiry but use resources from elsewhere. 11 12 It doesn't need to be necessarily Police Scotland, they 13 can draw on resources from elsewhere to carry out their 14 investigations.

So it's a small team, it's providing leadership and it's carrying out an effective investigation. That's what you want them to be doing, so -- so I was trying to balance what I was saying by from Police Scotland if, you know, on day one we would apply -- you know, 22 resources were mentioned, we could apply 100 resources to it if that's what we wanted to do, so we would draw them from elsewhere, but we could apply that. The PIRC aren't in a position to do that and you wouldn't expect them to be in a position to do that.

Q. We heard from Garry McEwan that when he declared

1 a critical incident, that in theory he could have all the resources available that he needs and in fact that 2 3 could be from anywhere in Scotland, in theory, and he 4 could even ask for officers through mutual aid from 5 elsewhere nationally? In the country, yes. 6 Α. 7 So that's the capacity that Police Scotland had --Q. 8 Α. Yes. -- which couldn't be replicated by PIRC? 9 Q. 10 Α. No, absolutely not. But at the same time, as I understand your evidence 11 Q. 12 today, Police Scotland were to be supportive of PIRC and 13 the investigation and were prepared to provide resources 14 to PIRC should they require them, or request them. 15 Α. Yes. Is that --16 Q. Yes. 17 Α. MS GRAHAME: Now, I'm conscious of the time and the Chair 18 19 did say he would like to resort to our normal process, 20 so if I may I will ask to speak to the Chair now at the moment on the screen. 21 Good afternoon, I hope that perhaps this is 22 an appropriate moment to adjourn for the afternoon 23 24 break. 25 LORD BRACADALE: Yes. We will take a 15-minute break now.

1 Thank you. 2 (3.02 pm)3 (Short Break) 4 (3.18 pm)5 LORD BRACADALE: Yes, carry on please, Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. There's something that I'm going to 6 7 come back to but I'm waiting for a hard copy to arrive, so I will move on for the moment if you don't mind. 8 9 I would like to ask you about the situation after there was a handover from Police Scotland to PIRC and 10 you have explained that that would not be a fine 11 12 dividing line --13 Α. No. Q. -- it would be a transitional period and it may take 14 15 some time depending on the tasks that were being done. But once the handover had taken place to PIRC and they 16 17 were leading the investigation, and subject to support that Police Scotland were providing, was it PIRC 18 investigators who were essentially running the 19 20 investigation, perhaps with support but largely taking 21 the lead --22 Α. Yes. Q. -- taking charge of matters, directing, strategising; 23 24 that was up to PIRC? A. Yes, that's right. 25

- Q. Now had -- at any point in your role as Gold Commander
 was it brought to your attention that there was someone
 called a Mr John Sallens, who we have heard may have
 been a private detective or a precognition officer, and
 who was going round speaking to possible witnesses? Did
 you hear anything of that?
- 7 A. No.

- Q. I'm interested in what your view would have been if -from a Police Scotland perspective, if you had heard
 that a person such as a private detective had been going
 round speaking to witnesses about the Sheku Bayoh
 incident in the early period, would that have caused you
 any concerns?
 - A. Well, it depends on what the purpose of that was, so was it on behalf of a lawyer representing any of the individuals, or was it just a private detective going round for I don't know what purpose? If it that's the case then it's wholly inappropriate and Police Scotland ought to have taken action -- or the PIRC taken action to prevent that from happening.
 - Q. Now, we have not heard from Mr Sallens at this stage but my understanding is that he was engaged by Peter Watson who was a lawyer representing both individual officers and the Scottish Police Federation.
- 25 A. Right.

Q. And it may or may not be the case that this step was taken and arrangements put in place in anticipation that there would have been a fatal accident inquiry instructed at some point by the Crown. Now, we know that there was never an FAI, but in anticipation of that happening, because there had been a death after police contact, that that was at least a possibility and perhaps may have been viewed as mandatory at that stage.

With that extra background information, would it have caused you any concern that someone was going round --

A. I think that we would have contacted a Fiscal to have a bit of a discussion about what the view was, but at that stage whether that would be a discussion between ourselves and the Fiscal, or whether it would be a discussion between the PIRC and the Fiscal, but I would anticipate that there should be some discussion, you know, at that stage, and I'm not sure which Fiscal was involved at that stage, but I would have anticipated that there would have been some discussion to understand, you know, whether that was — whether that should be carried out and what steps could be taken to either allow that to happen or to prevent it from happening if it was believed that it was going to undermine the investigation.

- Q. Right. And so would the concerns have been it
 potentially could have undermined the investigation in
- 3 some way?

22

23

24

- 4 A. Yes, absolutely.
- Q. And you have said to consider what steps could have been taken to stop it. What, as far as you know, what steps could have been taken to stop -- thank you, I think this may be my hard copy arriving. Thank you.
- 9 Well, I assume that from a legal perspective that the Α. 10 Fiscal would speak to Peter Watson in terms of what was actually happening and have a better understanding 11 12 perhaps than we could have of, you know, what was going 13 on, why it was going on and then get a Fiscal's view in 14 terms of whether it should continue or not. But the 15 Fiscal presumably could speak to Peter Watson and instruct him -- because, you know, it's their 16 17 investigation at that stage, but there may well be legal support, legal, you know, whatever for him to carry that 18 out. I don't know. But the sensible course of action 19 20 would be to have a conversation with a Fiscal to better 21 understand the legal implications of what was going on.
 - Q. Would Police Scotland have considered speaking to witnesses that had maybe been approached by Mr Sallens to see what the nature of the discussion with them had been?

- 1 Α. Well, I don't know, but -- well, so back to, you know, what I said was we would -- I would hope we would have 2 3 a discussion with the Fiscal and then have an 4 understanding of what it was that we would -- we ought 5 to do and then if that in the round was what was suggested, that we go back and find out what Mr Sallens 6 7 was about, then that's what we would do. But it was pretty -- you know, so there's Police Scotland, there's 8 9 the PIRC, Police Scotland being careful about how --10 you know, they don't undermine the PIRC investigation and then obviously a third party -- because normally in 11 12 any other incidents what you would have is you would 13 have police carry out the investigation, they report to 14 the Crown and then defence become involved or lawyers 15 become involved and then it's open to them to go and precognosce witnesses, take statements off witnesses. 16 17 That would be I think the normal course of what would happen but the truth is I don't know on what basis that 18 19 this was being undertaken.
- Q. And nothing like this was brought to your attention?
- 21 A. I absolutely don't remember it being.
- Q. And if the police had spoken to a witness and that
 witness explained that he had become concerned that the
 gentleman was making comments about Sheku Bayoh which
 were unflattering, if I can describe it in that way,

- 1 would that have caused you concern?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Can you explain why?
- 4 A. Well, I mean why would anybody be making comments that
- 5 are unflattering, at that stage at this sensitive
- 6 period? It is beyond belief. It's appalling.
- 7 Q. And would you be concerned about the impact on the
- 8 investigation?
- 9 A. Yes, of course. You know, if these -- sorry, if these
- 10 are witnesses that the PIRC or the police expect to give
- 11 evidence and we've got someone going around and engaging
- them in whatever fashion, which doesn't sound like
- a very good fashion, then that ultimately may well
- 14 undermine the investigation.
- Q. Right. If you had heard from another witness who became
- 16 concerned that people were knocking on her door and
- 17 actually took the step that she stopped answering the
- door to people, would that have caused concern for you
- in relation to the investigation?
- 20 A. Well, it gives me concern on a number of different
- 21 levels. No person in this country should be frightened
- 22 to answer their door, so -- and of course it gives me
- 23 concern as far as the investigation is concerned.
- Q. And what would those concerns be in relation to any
- impact on the investigation?

- A. Well, I mean it obviously impacts on the witness, so -you know, so I don't know what the witness evidence is
 or was and how that would impact directly, but,
 you know, people otherwise than the police going round
 chapping on people's doors and asking them questions
- about an enquiry that's ongoing doesn't feel like a good
 way to be going about their business.
- 8 Q. Would it cause you any concern if the possible witnesses
 9 gained the impression that this gentleman was carrying
 10 out an investigation for Police Scotland?
- 11 A. Yes, it would cause me serious concern.
- 12 Q. And why would that be?
- A. Well, because he is creating an impression that he is
 a police officer. I think from the name he was an
 ex-police officer, but of course that would cause me
 concern. They need -- anybody that takes or speaks to
 a member of the public ought to identify who they
 actually are and why they want to carry out these
 investigations.
- 20 Q. Thank you. Could you give me one moment please.
- 21 A. I certainly will.
- 22 (Pause).
- Q. I may come back to that in a moment. I have now got my
 hard copy of a document and it was something we were
 discussing earlier before the break and I just want to

1 follow up with that, so this is -- what I have in front of me is a daybook used by Nicola Shepherd and have you 2 3 also been given a hard copy of this? 4 Α. I have, yes. 5 Now, I don't think this will be on the playlist for Q. today which -- so I'm not in a position to display it on 6 7 the screen, but for those listening behind me who have it, it is PS10011. And as you have told us, 8 9 Nicola Shepherd was involved in matters relating to 10 community impact and the daybook says at the top of it, "Community Impact and Reassurance Group", and she 11 12 mentions Chief Superintendent McEwan, and there's 13 a number of topics and such-like that she is dealing 14 with in relation to community impact. 15 Can I ask you to look at -- sorry, my pages aren't numbered, page 4, and this is headed up, "Staff 16 17 meeting": "Chief Superintendent; Superintendent Milton; 18 19 Amanda Givan, Federation; me taking the minute." 20 And it is a meeting -- it appears to have been 21 chaired by Chief Superintendent McEwan. 22 Α. Yes. And then on the next page, page 5, it says: 23 Q. 24 "PM cause of death unexplained pending toxicology." And it then says: 25

- "No evidence of any significant blunt force trauma." 1 So this is just above halfway down --2 3 Α. I see it, yes. 4 -- the page and this follows on from the conversation we Q. 5 were having before the break about police officers being advised about the post mortem and the outcome of that 6 7 post mortem and I think I explained to you that initially the view was cause of death was "unascertained 8 pending investigations". 9
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. But you will see that here it does mention:
- "PM cause of death unexplained pending toxicology."
- But in addition to that information was obtained

 after the post mortem that there was no evidence of any

 significant blunt force trauma.
- 16 A. Mm-hm.
- Q. And as I understand it the evidence that's been led 17 18 before the Inquiry, officers were advised on the evening 19 of 4 May, so the Monday, not just that the post mortem 20 was unascertained cause of death pending investigations, 21 but that there had been no evidence of any significant 22 blunt force trauma. And so they were given some additional information about the outcome of the 23 24 post mortem.
- 25 A. Yes.

is unascertained.

24

25

1 Q. Essentially given information that ruled out the 2 possibility that blunt force trauma had caused the death of Mr Bayoh. Now, we have heard evidence in the Inquiry 3 4 from a PC Tomlinson who told the Chair that he had 5 struck Mr Bayoh to the head two or three times with his baton and that he had in addition struck his arms or 6 7 body two or three times with his baton. He gave evidence to the Chair and explained that when he 8 returned to Kirkcaldy Police Office he was upset and he 9 10 was upset that striking him with the baton had perhaps contributed to the ultimate outcome. 11 12 Now, I wonder in light of that -- we obviously 13 talked about the officers -- you have given evidence 14 about the officers being told about the post mortem on 15 the Monday evening before the family. We also talked about the fact that the officers hadn't given 16 17 evidence -- hadn't given statements to PIRC until 4 June, a month later. Seeing now there that they were 18 19 also given evidence about -- given information that the 20 death was not caused by any significant blunt force 21 trauma, does that information cause you any concerns --22 Yeah, I think it's --Α. Q. -- about them getting -- it wasn't just simply the death 23

No, well, I think that's too much information at that

1 stage without having provided statements because you 2 would want to marry up the statements with the 3 post mortem outcomes. So, you know, declaring that it 4 is unexplained or unascertained, as it actually was, 5 then I don't see any difficulty with that, that's fine, that's keeping everybody up-to-date with what's going 6 7 on, but without disclosing any evidence. I mean what it says is, "No evidence of any 8 9 significant blunt force trauma". You know, that doesn't 10 mean to say that there wasn't trauma and I think, as was already said, the pathologist, you know, will say that 11 12 there could be, you know, no signs externally but there 13 may well be at some later stage signs internally, 14 you know. So, you know, after a few days it may well be 15 that bruising becomes relevant, or that it is easier to see, so in my opinion it is a bit early to disclose that 16 17 information. 18 Q. So as Gold Commander obviously this topic was raised at 19 the 12.30 meeting on the 4th. 20 Α. Yes. 21 As you can see, things developed after the post mortem Q. 22 took place? Yes, that's right. 23 Α. Q. Would you have wanted to have been briefed on this issue 24 25 before information was given to police officers?

10

11

- 1 Α. Well, so I think -- well, what I wanted to happen, and we saw that, was that PIRC would be consulted on what 2 3 was -- what the officers were to be told in terms of the 4 post mortem, so I absolutely can't recall having any 5 discussion about that whatsoever, so I don't know whether there was agreement between the PIRC and the 6 7 SIO, or whatever, but, you know, from my perspective, as I already said, I think that full information is -- it's 8 too early to provide to the officers at the very least. 9
 - Q. So if they had come back to you and asked, "Should we disclose this?" What would your response have been?
- 12 I would say, well, give me the rationale for doing that Α. 13 and if there was a really good rationale that might be 14 absolutely fine, but in the main I would be saying well, 15 we have not got statements, we haven't got an understanding of exactly what each officer is going to 16 17 say, you know, and does that give them information that 18 would allow them to -- and obviously it hasn't because the officer has honestly told exactly what's happened, 19 20 but it would be my concern that someone had struck 21 Mr Bayoh with a baton and then wouldn't disclose it at a later stage, so -- but, you know, it feels like that's 22 probably not what's happened in any event, so it might 23 not be as damaging as it looks like it could be. 24
 - Q. But it could have been?

1 A. It could have been damaging.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Would your concern at that stage be not to cause any possible damage, or to avoid causing any possible damage to the investigation?
- 5 Yes, absolutely, it's back to what I said. From Α. 6 a policing perspective we need to make sure that we have 7 secured everything, don't lose everything, don't lose any evidence and hand that over so that a proper, 8 9 effective, independent investigation can be carried out, 10 so -- and then everything that we do ought to be in discussion with the PIRC about what it is that we're 11 12 going to disclose to the officers, how we're going to go about the interviews based on the fact that we hadn't 13 14 got the initial statements and just get that agreement 15 and understanding.
 - Q. Thank you. Now, we were talking, before I got my hard copy, of the situation regarding Mr Sallens and I was putting some evidence to you about -- and I think I used the word "unflattering". I was having some checks made on the actual evidence that we heard and I just want to tell you what that was in case it changes anything that you said.

So the evidence was from a Kevin Nelson and for those behind me his Inquiry statement is SBPI00014, and the Inquiry has evidence from Mr Sallens through his

1 Inquiry statement as well as orally that -- sorry, through Kevin Nelson, I should say, that Mr Sallens told 2 3 him negative things about Sheku Bayoh and in oral 4 evidence he said he described Mr Sallens as: 5 "Answer: ... sprinkling seeds to try and influence [him] negatively about Sheku Bayoh." 6 7 So I think I used the words "unflattering comments" but that is the description given by a witness, 8 9 Mr Nelson, who has also given oral evidence to the 10 Inquiry. Is there anything in there that changes any of the evidence that you have --11 12 No, not at all. It reinforces exactly what I said. Α. Thank you very much. Can we go back to your Inquiry 13 Q. 14 statement please and I would like to move on to 15 paragraph 244. This relates to -- I have a number of questions about equality and diversity: 16 17 "This means taking account of the ethnicity of the deceased and his family. Ensure there is an 18 19 understanding of that. Ensuring a knowledge of what 20 cultural issues there might be. It's having an 21 understanding of their background, how they're dealt 22 with, how they expect to be dealt with, and the kind of things they would want to update the [Fiscal] on in 23 relation to the death and future funeral arrangements. 24 In the round it's having that understanding of what 25

1 cultural issue there might be, how to deal with the 2 family and various aspects. Most FLOs will have an 3 awareness of equality and diversity issues, but if 4 that's reinforced then I think that's good practice." 5 You clearly have an understanding of the importance of ethnicity, diversity, equality issues. In your role 6 7 in Police Scotland at that time did you have obligations in relation to equality and diversity? 8 So I had Safer Communities, so that was more in relation 9 Α. 10 to engaging with communities and the public, but engaging with the various communities in terms of 11 12 ethnicity, so that all came under my remit. 13 Right. And did you have particular responsibilities, Q. 14 for example under the Equalities Act, in terms of 15 assessing the statistics for Police Scotland, or 16 anything of that sort? Sorry, so in -- statistics in relation to ~...? 17 Α. 18 To equality and diversity, in relation to ethnicity, in Q. 19 relation to bias, anything along those lines? So we had -- as part of what we did, we reviewed crime 20 Α. 21 reports to make sure that there was, you know, 22 an appropriate response. So I had a small department of very few people, but nonetheless focused on racially 23 motivated criminality and offences, so that group had 24 a look through crime reports on a day-to-day basis to 25

- make sure they were being appropriately managed, that we knew and understood what the issues were and whether from a central perspective that we could support the local division and local people in terms of giving the appropriate response to the individuals, the families, the community that was concerned.
- 7 Q. What was the name of this small department?
- 8 A. Well, it was within Safer Communities.
- 9 Q. Right, I see. And was that -- those working in the
 10 department, were they available as a resource to other
 11 areas to maybe come and seek advice and guidance?
- 12 A. Yes, absolutely.
- Q. And did they have any role in analysing differentials between treatment of people, such as black men?
- 15 A. Well, I'm not -- you would need to ask them about that,

 16 but do you mean in terms of the police response to that?
- 17 Q. Yes.
- 18 Well, whether they went into it in that amount of detail Α. 19 or not, I can't tell you now, but they explored crime 20 reports, they fed back in terms of the investigation 21 that was carried out and, you know, support whichever division it was in terms of what the cultural issues 22 might be and, you know, an overview of if there were 23 instances of that crime, either across the country or 24 locally. So it would be a view in that way but with 25

1 their background and knowledge then being able to support the local community to provide an effective 2 3 response to crime reports, you know, reports of racially 4 motivated crime, you know, whether we had spikes or 5 whatever. Q. Can I ask you to look at paragraph 49 of your Inquiry 6 7 statement. You say: "I have been asked if race and discrimination were 8 factors in oversight of reports. I think it probably 9 10 was. We're recording and monitoring all the statistics. I'd need to go back to that time to look at the package 11 12 of what was being monitored." 13 You've got a hard copy if you want to look around 14 that paragraph, but can you tell us a little bit more 15 about the statistics that were being recorded and monitored? 16 A. I can't remember now to be honest. I mean I said --17 18 you know, so I'm pretty sure that we were recording and 19 monitoring statistics, but I can't tell you at this 20 stage exactly what was being recorded. We would need to 21 go back and, you know, from -- you would get from 22 Police Scotland what was being recorded at that stage, but I can't remember now. 23 Q. But this would have been something that the safer -- the 24 25 people, your department in Safer Communities would

- 1 perhaps be able to assist us with?
- 2 A. I think so, yes.
- 3 Q. Can I ask you what your recollection is of the procedure
- 4 in May 2015 for any officers who would wish to report
- 5 concerns regarding potential racism by another officer?
- 6 A. Well, they initially could report it to a supervisor and
- 7 then from there an investigation could be instigated and
- 8 depending on what the outcome of that was, whether it
- 9 was criminal or non-criminal, then it would proceed
- 10 either to Procurator Fiscal or it would be dealt with
- internally.
- 12 Q. And was that process or procedure well-known amongst
- 13 officers?
- 14 A. Well, I hope so but we would need to ask the officers
- 15 themselves I suppose whether it was or not, but
- (inaudible).
- Q. We have heard it suggested that perhaps there was
- under-reporting in Police Scotland in 2015. Would you
- 19 agree with that?
- 20 A. That's entirely possible.
- Q. Did you have experience of dealing with any complaints
- 22 or allegations of racist behaviour by police officers?
- 23 A. I did, yes.
- Q. Can you tell us a little bit more about your experience
- 25 of --

- 1 Α. Well, my experience -- I suppose my experience is that, 2 you know, your previous question was about 3 under-reporting. I have no doubt there will be 4 under-reporting. You know, officers will not want to 5 report on their colleagues, that will be the starting point of that. But we have had people come forward and 6 7 report racially motivated incidents and they have been enquired into, so I have had officers under my --8 9 an officer anyway, at least one officer under my command 10 who was racially discriminated against and, you know, so that was dealt with and -- yes, so that was dealt with. 11 12 Q. Was that by another officer? 13 Yes. Α. 14 And when was that? Q. 15 20 ... I think it was probably in times of -- where was Α. it? Strathclyde Police, so it would be prior to 2013. 16 Prior to the death of Sheku Bayoh? 17 Q. 18 Α. Yes. 19 And you have said it was Strathclyde Police, was this Q. 20 when you were in your role in Strathclyde rather than in
- 22 A. Yes.

Fife?

- Q. And was there disciplinary action taken against this officer alleged to have been acting discriminatorily?
- 25 A. Well -- so I don't remember the outcome of that to be

1 honest, but action would have been taken against 2 officers in terms of racially motivated incidents or 3 discrimination, but I don't have the record of that and 4 you would need to research that in terms of 5 Police Scotland. But in terms of what I recollect, 6 you know, someone reporting a racially motivated 7 incident and then -- or discrimination and then that had been taken forward, you know, so -- yes. 8 And how -- can you help the Chair understand how often 9 Q. 10 that was something that landed on your desk or --No, not very often at all, it was at that stage because 11 Α. 12 that officer worked for me, was under my command, but 13 it's not something that -- you know, that happened that 14 often and certainly not from my perspective, but it may 15 well be that there were reports through the Deputy Chief Constable Designate, both to Police Scotland and to 16 Strathclyde Police, but you need to go back to the 17 records of both Strathclyde, if they're still available 18 19 or not, and to Police Scotland now from 2013 until this date. 20 21 Right. As part of your role as ACC did you have any Q. 22 role in equality impact assessments, or the preparation of equality impact assessments? 23 24 Α. Well, so -- well, depending on what was being

undertaken, you know, events or whatever, then the

25

- 1 equality impact assessments would have been completed
- for each -- or ought to have been completed for each
- 3 one.
- 4 Q. Is that something that you had any responsibility for
- 5 when you were --
- A. Well, if you were involved in chairing Gold for an
- 7 incident, you would have an expectation that an impact
- 8 assessment would be carried out.
- 9 Q. And who would have carried out the impact assessment in
- 10 relation to Sheku Bayoh's investigation?
- 11 A. I don't know.
- 12 Q. Is that something that would have been addressed at the
- Gold Group meetings?
- 14 A. It probably should have been.
- Q. And you have told us that Nicola Shepherd had a role in
- 16 relation to the community.
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. Would it have been someone else, one of the other Bronze
- 19 Commanders that would have dealt with equality impact
- 20 assessments?
- 21 A. Well, you know, if Nicola Shepherd was in a position to
- 22 carry out an equality impact assessment then I would
- 23 expect that that's when it would be undertaken but --
- Q. Do you remember --
- 25 A. No, I don't remember that. I don't remember it being

1 carried out. 2 But was it commonly done by someone in the Gold Group --Q. Well, it would be done --3 Α. -- at that time? 4 Q. 5 Sorry. It would be done on behalf of the Gold Group by Α. 6 someone. 7 Q. Right. Can I ask you a couple of questions about paragraph 341 of your Inquiry statement. I think you 8 9 say -- I think you were asked about training on 10 unconscious bias and you say here: "I don't recollect any training about unconscious 11 12 bias. It means we're all conditioned in some way and 13 because of our conditioning we have a bias towards 14 particular elements, whether that's race, religion, or 15 other elements such as LGBT." And I have asked a number of witnesses if they had 16 17 any training in unconscious bias, so did you ever have 18 any training throughout your career in that concept? 19 Well, I can't specifically say that it was focused on Α. 20 unconscious bias, but I have had training in equality and diversity and I have had -- you know, I have been on 21 22 many, many training courses in which equality and diversity would have been discussed but whether we had 23 formal training in terms of unconscious bias, 24 I absolutely don't remember that and I don't remember 25

1 having training, but because of my role I was conscious and understood what unconscious bias was and is. 2 And from your recollection of the training that was 3 Q. 4 given at that time in Police Scotland in 2015, was 5 training given to officers about how to guard against unconscious bias? 6 I don't know. So fairly obviously officers would go 7 Α. to -- you know, you need to check with the training 8 centre, but officers would go to the various courses 9 10 they were on, right from probational training all the way up to superintendent, chief superintendent level in 11 12 the organisation, so that training would be ongoing, so 13 I don't -- you know, I wouldn't have known then exactly what the training was and I don't recollect it now, 14 15 so ... Right, I won't ask you any more questions about that 16 Q. 17 then. 18 Can I ask you to look at paragraph 345 please and it 19 may be that you have already answered this question: 20 "I have been asked if I know of any examples of 21 discriminatory behaviour in Kirkcaldy. I can't give 22 a specific instance. When I was the Deputy at Strathclyde, many incidents would have passed my desk. 23 I can't remember any more specifics such as who was 24 being discriminated against. I am not aware of any 25

1 racist views held by police officers. I've not heard any racist views or comments by police officers." 2 3 I think -- is this part of what you have already mentioned to us today, that you did have a complaint 4 5 about racist behaviour on your desk at one time when you 6 were in Strathclyde? 7 Α. Yes, that's right. And that was a complaint against a fellow 8 Q. police officer? 9 10 Α. Yes, that's right. You say, "many incidents would have passed my desk", you 11 Q. 12 have said that the one you remember was in relation to 13 a police officer. We have heard evidence that there can 14 sometimes be complaints about racism alleged against 15 police officers by members of the public, people who are accused of offending, as well as by police officers 16 17 themselves. Do you remember any other examples, perhaps from -- in relation to police officers themselves other 18 19 than the one you have given us? No, I don't remember. I don't. 20 Α. 21 So in terms of the "many incidents" that would have Q. 22 passed your desk, who would predominantly have been making those complaints? 23 So I think when I'm talking about "many incidents passed 24 Α.

my desk", I'm talking more broadly in terms of my role

25

1 in discipline. 2 Oh, I see. So many incidents would have passed your Q. 3 desk, it wasn't relating to discriminatory behaviour? 4 Α. No, so I think what I was trying to explain was, 5 you know, there would be a lot of incidents would have passed over my desk but -- and, you know, I couldn't be 6 7 more specific about which ones were in terms of discrimination. 8 Am I right in saying you were in the Professional 9 Q. 10 Standards Department at one time? I was in charge of the Professional Standards Department 11 Α. 12 for Strathclyde Police. That's going back a while. 13 Sorry. Were you aware of complaints from that time in Q. 14 your career about -- complaints of racism by 15 police officers? I can't be specific about -- you know, so that goes back 16 Α. 17 to 2012 or wherever. I can't be specific about what 18 came across my desk. I would be briefed on the many incidents and decisions would have been taken about how 19 20 that was taken forward, but I can't give specific 21 instances at this moment in time. But I'm sure by going 22 back to the records you would be able to see how many instances there were and how many reports there were. 23 24 Q. Right, thank you.

Can I ask you to look at paragraph 98 please and it

1 says: "There are multiple communities. The local 2 3 community in the Kirkcaldy area would be the starting 4 point. There's also Sheku Bayoh's community, from his 5 ethnic background. That would be in Kirkcaldy and also nationally. Family can also be a community. Then also 6 7 a more general community right across the country. They may have views about what happened." 8 9 I'm interested in this idea about the communities 10 and Mr Bayoh's community. Can you explain a little bit more about this paragraph and what you meant? 11 12 Α. Yes, so it's -- you know, so we wouldn't focus on just 13 one community, understanding what communities there are 14 in the Kirkcaldy area and those that might be impacted, 15 so Sheku Bayoh's community, the black community, you know, focusing on his ethnic background, but that 16 17 wouldn't be just about Kirkcaldy, and you know what I spoke about there, there would be a national picture 18 in Scotland but there would also be a national picture 19 20 across the UK and actually this might impact much wider 21 than that. 22 So it's really understanding where the impact is, and of course the family themselves, you know, might --23 are a community that you would be interested in and we 24 spoke about that. So every one of them would 25

- 1 potentially have a view on what's happened, so we would
- 2 want to know and understand that from a policing point
- 3 of view. So it's really -- you know, it's really
- 4 diverse, I suppose.
- 5 Q. Thank you. Can I ask you some questions about training.
- 6 We will be hearing further evidence in this Inquiry
- 7 about training at a later hearing. In your role as
- 8 Gold Commander did anyone ever express concern to you in
- 9 relation to -- in the context of the death of Mr Bayoh
- and the investigation -- about the adequacy of officer
- safety training or even first aid training that was
- 12 provided to officers at that time?
- 13 A. No, not at all.
- Q. No? Do you remember any questions or concerns or views
- being expressed about whether the officers had received
- 16 adequate training?
- 17 A. No, not at all.
- 18 Q. Or whether they had received adequate training in issues
- of equality and diversity?
- 20 A. No, I don't recall that at all.
- 21 Q. I think you deal with training from your own perspective
- 22 in paragraphs -- from paragraph 18 in if your Inquiry
- 23 statement. I don't need you to look at that. You have
- 24 told us -- I have asked you specifically about
- 25 unconscious bias training.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Had you received specific training prior to May 2015
- 3 about racial discrimination?
- A. Well, not as a one-off course, but I assume that on the
- 5 many courses that I have been on, that there's been
- 6 discussion but not as a specific bespoke training
- 7 course.
- 8 Q. Right. And when you say you assume, is that because
- 9 your recollection isn't clear, or~...?
- 10 A. I have been on so many training courses that, you know,
- over a 33-year period that I can't recollect what was at
- 12 each training course, but, you know, there would have
- been training in relation to each aspect of that.
- 14 My job, my interaction with people, my interaction
- 15 with communities would allow me to garner information,
- so, you know, so you start with a training course at
- a training school or wherever we go and then by the work
- that you do you enhance your understanding of whatever
- aspect of community it is that we're dealing with.
- Q. Thank you. Had you had any training in relation to
- 21 institutional racism?
- 22 A. It's exactly the same answer again.
- Q. Same answer.
- A. So specific bespoke training course, probably not, not,
- 25 but all of these things would be discussed at various

different -- so various different courses, various 1 2 different forums that I attended and for many of the 3 groups that I attended, as I already spoke about, the 4 advisory group, the strategic advisory group, these are 5 things that would have been brought up and brought to our attention quite forcibly, so ... 6 7 Q. Thank you. I'm not sure if I asked you about this yesterday, I think I did, I see it is here in my 8 9 questions again. Can I ask you, at any time did the 10 Gold Group meeting consider the possibility of the Health and Safety Executive being brought in --11 12 Α. No. 13 -- to assist or support PIRC? Q. 14 Α. No. 15 No. There was never any discussion about that Q. 16 possibility? 17 We never -- no. As I said, it's stabilise, hold Α. 18 everything and ask the PIRC to come in and carry out the 19 investigation. No. 20 Thank you. Can I ask you to consider the media Q. 21 engagement at the time of Mr Bayoh's death. Looking 22 back now, do you have any concerns about the way the Police Service handled the media at that time? 23

A. Yes, we need to go back and have a look at exactly

what's happening, but from my perspective the less said

24

- to the media at that point the better, so it's a holding statement -- at the beginning anyway, it's a holding statement and it's to acknowledge that the enquiry has been handed over to the PIRC, you know, and it may well be that for specific reasons we want to enlarge on that, or engage the media for specific reasons about, you know, witnesses or whatever that is, but, you know, we need to think about that really carefully.
 - Q. Did you have any concerns about information that was being put out into the media, or on social media about Mr Bayoh?
- 12 A. Well, no information should have been put out, or very
 13 little information should have been put out, apart from
 14 the fact that we had the incident and that the PIRC was
 15 carrying out an investigation. That would be the
 16 preferred route.
 - Q. And if it had been up to you, is that something you would have not put out much information about Mr Bayoh?
 - A. That would be my preference. But, as I said, there might be a debate on whether -- that we ought to put out some statements in terms of witnesses so that we get a better understanding of what's happening, but this is not -- you know, so it's not different to many other enquiries where at the very beginning until you get a proper understanding of what's going on, you know, and

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- this is a holding statement that you require at the very
 beginning, so very little information at that stage.

 And of course that might expand, but from our police
 perspective, hand over to the PIRC and then it's for the
 PIRC then to engage with the media, if that's indeed
 what's required.
 - Q. Right. And looking back now -- and obviously we have spent quite a bit of time going over some of the circumstances, perhaps I have explained to you some of the detailed evidence we have heard, I have asked you to comment on that and looking back now at the way the investigation was conducted and matters progressed, do you overall have concerns about the way this was handled by the police?
- 15 So I think we could have managed it better. It may well Α. be that I should have been more intrusive in terms of 16 17 some aspects of what was going on but, as I say, 18 you know, we were -- what I was trying to do, what I was 19 trying to achieve was -- I keep repeating myself, I'm 20 sorry, but it is that holding -- is holding -- the 21 holding pattern and being able to hand over to the PIRC, 22 so, you know, we're trying to do what we can but as little as we can before we've got that independent, 23 objective oversight into what's happening. 24
- 25 MS GRAHAME: Could you give me a moment please because

1	I would like to address the Chair on a matter. I'm
2	aware now that it is after 4 o'clock and if you don't
3	mind.
4	I wonder if it would be possible for us to rise now.
5	I would like to an opportunity overnight to reflect on
6	some further questions. I don't anticipate I will take
7	very long tomorrow but I'm also conscious that there may
8	be Rule 9 applications tomorrow morning and I would like
9	an opportunity to speak to the core participants about
LO	that before I conclude my examination and I wondered if
L1	it would be possible to rise slightly early today.
L2	Sorry, I
L3	LORD BRACADALE: I think I muted my microphone.
L 4	Sorry, I think that's an entirely sensible approach,
L5	so, Mr Nicolson, would you return tomorrow because there
L6	may be some further questions for you.
L7	We will then adjourn now until tomorrow at
L8	10 o'clock.
L9	(4.09 pm)
20	(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Friday,
21	15 September 2023)
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
2	INDEX
3	
4	MR RUARAIDH NICOLSON (continued)1
5	Questions from MS GRAHAME (continued)1
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	