1	Friday, 15 September 2023
2	(10.00 am)
3	MR RUARAIDH NICOLSON (continued)
4	(In the absence of the witness)
5	LORD BRACADALE: Good morning. Ms Grahame.
6	MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I'm grateful for the opportunity to
7	reflect on any further questions overnight. I do not
8	have any further questions for this witness and we may
9	now proceed to the next stage in proceedings.
10	For your information the witness is not within the
11	hearing space. We have one Rule 9 application or
12	a Rule 9 application from Ms Mitchell KC and she is
13	ready to address you if you're ready to hear from her.
14	LORD BRACADALE: Ms Mitchell, when you're ready.
15	Rule 9 application from MS MITCHELL
16	MS MITCHELL: I'm obliged.
17	Sir, there are a number of questions that I would
18	like to ask of this witness. The first relates to the
19	issue of the time it took for PIRC to become involved in
20	the investigation. In particular he indicated that by
21	11.30 he had still had no contact with PIRC and he
22	explained that it took time to put teams together. What
23	I would like to explore with him is does he think it
24	would be a good idea in future if, rather than waiting
25	for teams to be put together and assembled to come

en masse, he had an immediate communication with whoever was going to be at the head of the investigation and that person attend all Gold Group meetings, even by way simply of telephone call so that they would be appraised of all the relevant information from the outset, so it's really to ask him whether or not he thinks that's a good idea.

The second matter I want to ask him about is

Gold Command and how that works. Yesterday we heard

evidence -- perhaps the day before -- where this witness
said that if it things went awry he would step in. Now,

put short, we have a catalogue of things that went awry,

and for speed I won't list them here, but I will give

the witness the opportunity to reflect on a number of

things that it would respectfully seem quite obviously

went wrong, but because of the way Gold Command appears

to work he doesn't actually know about any of these

things. For example, he didn't know -- and in

particular I would like to highlight this issue with him

as one of the failures -- he didn't know that the

police officers hadn't been asked for operational

statements.

So what I want to ask is in light of various things that went wrong and things that he admitted that should never have happened, whether or not he thinks

Gold Command needs to change either its structure or its meetings in order that if and when things aren't going right, those at the highest echelons understand that and do something about it.

The third issue I want to ask about was his position that one of the first and most important things he wanted to do was rule out that this was a terrorist incident in order that he could give comfort to the public.

The first thing that I want to ask him about in relation to that is that the issue of terrorism is flagged up, was it revisited at any time where he said to the command -- or in these command meetings, "The issue of terrorism has been ruled out", and what I want to do is put to him the evidence of Nicola Shepherd who said, "At no time was terrorism ruled out and that is why I didn't communicate it to anyone."

I also want to clearly ask him whether or not he realises that despite his saying that that was one of his first and most important issues, that it simply wasn't dealt with and that Nicola Shepherd said that she wasn't made aware it wasn't a terrorist issue, didn't pass it on and doesn't remember it ever being spoken about, other than being raised as a possibility in these meetings. So it's to explore that particular issue with

him. 1 The next issue, number 4, is also about the issue of 2 3 terrorism matters. This Inquiry will know that sadly we 4 have heard that knife crime is all too common and police 5 are called out to attend such things with alarming regularity. What I want to know from him is are these 6 7 sorts of cases considered possible terrorist matters, and also if it had been a white man with a knife on that 8 9 day, would he also have been asking if it was 10 a terrorist matter. And the Inquiry will remember that a question of that nature has already been allowed to be 11 12 put to another witness and I would respectfully submit 13 I think it would be important that, given his status as 14 Gold Commander, this would be put to him. 15 The next issue I would like to raise with him is the recording of information. The recording of information 16 17 on the minutes seems very sparse and it contains some 18 information, for example information to suggest that the 19 deceased had an argument with his partner, 20 Collette Bell, but what it doesn't say is, 21 "Police officers refusing to give statements". There 22 was nothing about positional asphyxia but there was questions about whether or not this was terrorism. What 23 I would be asking this witness to -- the question 24

I would be liking to ask this witness is first of all

25

why were these things not there and, secondly, is there a better way of recording the information? For example, we all have phones that we can record things now, or videos that we can record these meetings. Is there a better way of recording these sorts of very important meetings so we know quite frankly we're getting the detail of what happened on that day, what was said and what happened, and it would certainly no doubt of course cut down inquiries greatly if we were simply able to play the video of what happened in these meetings.

The next thing I would like to ask this witness about was his strategy. The reason why I would like to do that is we have heard from this witness as the chief he was, in his own words, wanting to get a grip and then hold on until PIRC took over, two separate statements. What I want to know from him is how does that square with the very different approach we have seen the more junior police officers seem to be taking with the investigation. We have heard police officers give evidence about the golden hours of the investigation, we have heard about the speed at which the enquiries had to be carried out, possibly the most egregious being Collette Bell having to give a statement ten minutes after she was told that her partner was dead while she had her baby with her.

1 I want to ask him to reflect upon how his strategy, to hold everything together and just hand over to PIRC, 2 3 was in evidence when we see these sorts of things 4 happening. The next question I would like to ask him about was 5 the issues of compelling or ordering someone to give 6 7 statements or fill out forms. Repeatedly this witness said in evidence that compulsion or ordering was an 8 9 option that was available, a question for example asked 10 by my learned friend: "Question: As Gold Commander could you have 11 12 influenced that or assisted with endeavours to obtain these use of spray forms?" 13 14 And he says: 15 "Answer: Well, short of ordering people to do that -- well, you know, you've got a reasonable 16 17 expectation ..." 18 Etc. And what I want to know is given the 19 importance of the use of force forms, given the 20 importance of PAVA spray, given the importance of 21 knowing what happened when the police met him, why did 22 he not give that order? Why was that order made? Why was it that he didn't go down, for example, to -- he was 23 in Kirkcaldy, why didn't he go down as the 24 Gold Commander and say, "I'm ordering you, I am 25

compelling you as part of your job to give these -- to
give operational statements and to fill out these
forms"?

The next matter that I would like to ask this witness about is public confidence. The witness made the point that PIRC had to take over the investigation and become in charge of the investigation to give public the confidence that what was going on was a transparent enquiry led by them and it was important -- that was important for public confidence in what the police were doing.

Against that background what I would like to ask him to do is to reflect upon what we have seen quite frankly which seems like a gaping hole in circumstances where people may have committed serious breaches of their duty, but because something is being handed over to PIRC, unless PIRC tell them about it, or the Crown prosecutes, then it wouldn't be known -- for example, it wouldn't be known a lot of the things that have happened unless we had had this Public Inquiry. I'll ask him to reflect upon whether or not he thinks that would affect confidence in what the police are doing.

It is also to ask him whether or not there's any time limit on disciplinary issues if they come to light at a later stage, if he is aware of that. He made

1 reference to the senior officers that were sitting in the hearing and what I want to ask him was that if they 2 3 had heard matters which constitute disciplinary 4 meetings, could that be done now. The 11th -- I think the 11th, I haven't counted them 5 carefully. The next issue is the mosque letter. The 6 7 Inquiry will remember that a letter was sent in respect of the complaint about how -- the way that the family 8 9 were treated, Zahid Saeed's family was treated, when 10 a complaint was thereafter made. The letter, the mosque letter does not identify, nor does anyone identify after 11 12 that complaint was made, that in fact there was not 13 a basis for the police to simply go in and tell these 14 people to leave their house. So even after a complaint 15 was made, that matter was not properly investigated and I would ask him does that surprise him and should that 16 17 have happened? The next matter I want to ask this witness about is 18 19 the issue of retrospective warrants. I would 20 respectfully suggest that this is important because there seems to be a distinct lack of clarity even at 21 22 very high levels as to what the powers of the police are in relation to what they can do with and without 23 a warrant at the relevant time. 24 25 At Martyn Dick's house an item was found and, as we

1	know, that was then seized by the police. My learned
2	friend was exploring that and she was exploring that in
3	terms of the question of whether or not a warrant was
4	necessary and the officer said well, he was asked:
5	"Question: He was advised to a get a warrant, can
6	you explain why that would be done if there is consent?"
7	And he said:
8	"Answer: Well, so the consent wouldn't be to search
9	for drugs. So the consent was to search in terms of the
10	incident that was being dealt with at the time. So if
11	they go in and they find something that's unrelated to
12	what they have already got consent for, so the sensible
13	approach is that you approach the Fiscal, you explain
14	the detail and the Fiscal will either agree to present
15	the detail to a Sheriff and ask for a warrant for the
16	property to seize the herbal material."
17	So he is saying that you need a warrant to seize the
18	herbal material. And then my learned friend went on to
19	say:
20	"Question: So if the Fiscal refuses a warrant, what
21	would you expect the police to do?"
22	And he says:
23	"Answer: I would expect the police to seize it and
24	take no other action."
25	So what I'm trying to explore there is the confusion

between thinking that a warrant needs to be obtained to seize that material and then if a warrant is refused his view as to what the police should do is to seize that material, so my question really is to explore what that problem is and why he thinks in those circumstances a warrant is necessary.

Going back on to a matter that was touched on earlier about recording and also about race, we heard about various hypotheses that were discussed and one of the most important and one of the ones he was considering was terrorism. What -- he wanted to get that dealt with because he felt that that would be a matter the general public would want to know about.

We have also heard evidence that other

police officers were very concerned because a black man

had died in police custody, that was a matter that he

was concerned about for the general public. And what

I want to know is in those circumstances, and the fact

that it was so obvious that race was perhaps an issue

that they should be thinking about, why do we see in

minutes reference to, for example, the hypothesis of

terrorism but not the hypothesis of race? Why is that

not recorded? Why are people not speaking about

positional asphyxia, a black man dying in police

custody, and why is that not being noted down?

1 Finally, in relation to racism I want to ask him questions about complaints within the police. It seems 2 3 that if complaints are made by police officers about 4 other police officers it is dealt with in an informal 5 manner with matters not -- with matters which can be raised with a more senior officer and be dealt with as 6 it were internally or in-house, with nothing going on 7 people's records unless the matter is escalated. 8 9 So what I want to explore with him is whether or not 10 he thinks it would be a good idea if any form of complaint that was made required to be recorded in some 11 12 way, even if it is resolved by the two police officers 13 themselves, because without doing that there can be no 14 security that any data that's been received about racism 15 within the police force, intra police officers or with general members of the public, we can't have any 16 17 confidence that those numbers are correct because the source is simply not being recorded. So I would like to 18 19 ask him about that particular issue and those are the 20 questions for this witness. 21 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms Mitchell. There is quite a lot of material there so I will take some time to 22 consider the application. I will adjourn for that 23 purpose. 24 (10.19 am)25

1	(Short Break)
2	(11.22 am)
3	LORD BRACADALE: I have carefully considered each of the
4	issues raised by Ms Mitchell. While many of the points
5	raised are perfectly valid ones, I consider that they
6	would best be developed in submissions.
7	In these cases there is a sufficient evidential
8	basis in the evidence of this witness, taken along with
9	the evidence that has already been led in the Inquiry,
10	and the evidence which is likely to be led that will
11	allow these points fully to be developed in submissions
12	In relation to some of the points I consider that
13	the questions would be more appropriately explored with
14	another witness, particularly bearing in mind that this
15	witness has been retired for a number of years.
16	In relation to some of the points I consider that
17	this witness has covered the ground to the extent that
18	he is able to do and that further exploration would
19	simply be repetitive.
20	I have therefore come to the view that it would not
21	assist the Inquiry to have further examination of the
22	witness in relation to any of the points raised by
23	Ms Mitchell.
24	Could we now have the witness brought back please.
25	(Pause).

Ι	(In the presence of the witness)
2	Good morning, Mr Nicolson. I'm sorry that you have
3	been kept waiting but I'm now able to tell you that
4	there will not be any further questions for you and that
5	your evidence is completed.
6	Thank you very much for coming to give evidence to
7	the Inquiry. Your evidence has covered a wide range of
8	subjects and I'm very grateful to you for the time that
9	you have taken to come and give evidence. You will be
LO	free to go when the Inquiry adjourns and I now adjourn
L1	the Inquiry.
L2	(11.25 am)
L3	(The Inquiry adjourned)
L 4	
L5	
L 6	
L7	
L8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
2	INDEX
3	
4	MR RUARAIDH NICOLSON (continued)1
5	Rule 9 application from MS MITCHELL1
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	