Tuesday, 6 February 2024 1 (10.00 am)2 3 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning and welcome to this hearing in the Sheku Bayoh Inquiry. 4 5 The Inquiry has now held 75 days of hearings. In addition much material has been published on the 6 7 website. As I have said before, the Inquiry's terms of reference are wide-ranging and as we move to explore the 8 9 next aspect of the remit, it may be convenient to 10 outline the programme of hearings that the Inquiry intends to follow this year. 11 12 Over the coming weeks we shall hear evidence 13 relating to the investigation carried out by the Police 14 Investigations and Review Commissioner, the PIRC. 15 In April into May we shall hear evidence relating to the direction of the investigation by the Lord Advocate, 16 17 together with certain other evidence. In June the Inquiry will conduct a hearing in relation to that 18 19 aspect of the terms of reference relating to race. 20 Thereafter I anticipate that all the remaining evidence 21 should be completed by the end of the year. So we shall now move to the chapter on the PIRC. If 22 23 we could have the first witness, please. 24 MR KEITH HARROWER (called) LORD BRACADALE: Good morning Mr Harrower, would you raise 25

1		your hand and say the words of the oath.
2		MR KEITH HARROWER (sworn)
3	LOF	RD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
4		Questions from MS GRAHAME
5	MS	GRAHAME: Thank you. Good morning Mr Harrower.
6	A.	Good morning.
7	Q.	Tell us what age you are?
8	A.	I am 63.
9	Q.	Your full name is Keith Harrower?
10	A.	That is correct, yes.
11	Q.	You worked for the Police Investigations and Review
12		Commissioner, since February 2013?
13	A.	That is correct, yes.
14	Q.	We are calling them "PIRC" here. It saves me saying the
15		full name every time I mention it. That was actually
16		before PIRC technically came into existence, wasn't it?
17	A.	Yes, it was roughly the months before we went
18		effectively went live.
19	Q.	We have heard that PIRC came into existence on
20		1 April 2013?
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	Is that correct?
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	And that was same date as Police Scotland came into
25		existence?

1	Α.	That is correct, yes.
2	Q.	In May 2015 you were a deputy senior investigator?
3	Α.	That is correct.
4	Q.	Since 1 March 2018 you have been in the role of
5		senior investigator?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	And that is a role you continue in today?
8	Α.	It is, for the next short while.
9	Q.	Are you due to retire soon?
10	Α.	Mm-hmm.
11	Q.	Very nice. We have heard that there are a number of
12		different investigators in PIRC, or certainly there were
13		in 2015. Am I right in saying that on ground level, if
14		I can put that way, there are investigators, and then
15		above that there are deputy senior investigators?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	And then senior investigators?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	So that's hierarchy in PIRC?
20	A.	And then the head of investigations thereafter and then
21		the senior management for the organisation.
22	Q.	So in 2015 I think there was a head of investigations
23		who was Irene Scullion?
24	A.	Yes.
25	Q.	And there is also a director of investigations,

1		a John Mitchell?
2	Α.	Director of operations.
3	Q.	Sorry, director of operations.
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	Was he called director of investigations in 2015? Has
6		his title changed?
7	A.	Not to my recollection, I am sure it's because it
8		covered the review section of the organisation as well
9		as the investigations, so there were two different areas
10		of business, plus the supporting department.
11	Q.	We are hoping to hear from Mr Mitchell later in the
12		hearing so he can perhaps
13	Α.	Confirm it.
14	Q.	confirm that. So the director, Mr Mitchell, at the
15		head of investigations, then Irene Scullion called the
16		head of investigations, and then senior investigators,
17		there was a Rick or Ricky Casey and John McSporran?
18	Α.	That is correct.
19	Q.	Deputy senior investigators, yourself, Keith Harrower,
20		Billy Little, Brian Dodd, Ian Macintyre and a couple of
21		others?
22	Α.	Yes, I think there was another senior investigator there
23		at the time as well, Mr Nutter.
24	Q.	And then investigators
25	Α.	Yes.

1	Q.	under there. Thank you. Prior to working for PIRC
2		you had been in Strathclyde Police since 1979?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	After four years you joined the CID and moved to the
5		Serious Crime Squad?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	You moved through the ranks during your career in the
8		police and for the last ten years of service you worked
9		in intelligence?
10	A.	That is correct.
11	Q.	And you retired after about 30 years
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	in the police. That was in 2009 and at that time
14		your rank was Temporary Detective Superintendent?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	And then you had a period between leaving the police,
17		before joining PIRC, of roughly around four years when
18		you did a variety of things?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	Have you watched any evidence in the Inquiry on
21		television or streamed?
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	You have. You will know there is a blue folder in front
24		of you, and if you want to have a look at that you will
25		see that there are hard copies of things like statements

1 and documents. You can use that at any time. If there is anything in there you think might assist you, please 2 3 feel free to look through it. As I go through documents 4 I will put some of them -- I will ask for some of then 5 to be put on the screen in front of you, but some people prefer hard copies so you will have some hard copies 6 7 available. If there is anything you would like to refer me to 8 9 to help me understand your evidence today, please let me 10 know. If we don't have it in the blue folder we will try and get it at the next break and we will have it 11 12 available at that stage. 13 Okay, thank you. Α. 14 Q. Can we look first of all at a PIRC statement which is 15 dated 6 August 2015. It's PIRC 00007. You may recognise this, it has your name at the top, and it was 16 17 a statement taken on 6 August 2015. But I think in your first Inquiry statement, which we will come to in 18

19 a moment, that you actually began preparing this

20 statement yourself on 4 May 2015?

A. That is correct, it was updated at different stages aswe progressed.

23 Q. So you added to this --

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. -- as things developed and things happened. I think in

1		your first Inquiry statement you say that this was
2		completed on 5 August 2015?
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	So it was prepared during that period May to August. In
5		completing this statement, you had access to your
6		notebook from PIRC and your operational notes relating
7		to the death of Mr Bayoh?
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	And your own recollection of what had happened or what
10		was going on?
11	Α.	Yes, and also there was a briefing document I prepared
12		as well which I had access to.
13	Q.	And these were all the things that you had at your
14		disposal when you prepared this first statement?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	Thank you. Then can we look at PIRC 00008. Again, this
17		is a statement by you, your name is at the top,
18		Deputy Senior Investigator. And if we can just move
19		down the page slightly. You see it is self-dictated
20		which means you wrote this yourself; is that correct?
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	And it relates to events between 12 and
23		14 August 2015
24	A.	Yes.
25	Q.	primarily regarding your involvement with meeting

1		a Dr Jason Payne-James, who was an expert, and also
2		handing over an expert witness package to a Nat Carey,
3		who we have actually heard evidence from in the hearing.
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	Then if we can move on to a third statement, PIRC 00009.
6		This is dated 27 May 2016. Again, self-typed by you in
7		Hamilton and if we can move down the page, please, you
8		see that you are talking about events on 2 June 2015.
9		You talk about taking a statement from
10		Detective Constable Andrew Mitchell
11	Α.	Correct.
12	Q.	who we have also heard from. And later in your
13		statement you talk about noting a statement from
14		a PC Brian Geddes, who we have also heard evidence from
15		in the Inquiry.
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	You also talk about taking other statements, including
18		one from a PC Ross Crawford, a national training
19		officer, and taking possession of the OST manual?
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	So these are things that you were involved in as part of
22		the PIRC investigation?
23	A.	That is correct.
24	Q.	Now, in your second Inquiry statement, which I will come
25		to shortly, you tell us at paragraph 225 that the

1		content of these three statements that we have just
2		looked at were true and accurate and to the best of your
3		knowledge.
4	Α.	That is correct.
5	Q.	And your recollection of events at the time you wrote
6		these statements was better than it is now, so if there
7		is any issue with differences between your Inquiry
8		statements and these PIRC statements, the Chair should
9		prefer the PIRC statements?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Thank you. Let's look at your first Inquiry statement,
12		please: is SBPI00259. You will see that this is the
13		first Inquiry statement dated taken on
14		28 October 2022 and I believe it is about 30 pages long.
15		You have signed every page of this statement. If we
16		look at the last page, we will see that it was signed on
17		6 February 2023. There we are. On the screen version
18		your signature has been redacted, but I think on the
19		version you have in hard copy you may recall you have
20		signed all the pages?
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	The last paragraph in this statement is 66. I will just
23		read that out:
24		"I believe the facts stated in this witness
25		statement are true. I understand that this statement

1		may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be
2		published on the Inquiry's website."
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	When you signed the statement you understood that that
5		was the case?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	In this first Inquiry statement at paragraph 3 you
8		specifically see that you refer to your previous
9		statements. Can you go down the page, please.
10		Thank you:
11		" if there was any discrepancy between this
12		statement~"
13		That is your first Inquiry statement:
14		" and [your] PIRC statement the Inquiry
15		statement has additional information and clarity on some
16		matters in answer to specific points and questions."
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	Am I correct in saying that if there is something not
19		mentioned in the PIRC statements, that is mentioned in
20		your Inquiry statements, the Chair should look at the
21		Inquiry statements and prefer that?
22	Α.	Yes, there was obviously significant additional
23		questions in relation to certain matters, so that was
24		expanded upon within the Inquiry statement, the
25		subsequent statement on behalf of the Inquiry

1 I submitted.

2	Q.	Thank you. You said a moment ago you began with PIRC
3		in February 2013. They officially came into existence
4		on 1 April 2013. Can you tell us in that short period
5		between you starting and PIRC coming into existence
6		officially what was your role at that time?
7	Α.	I was a first-line manager as
8		a deputy senior investigator along with a number of
9		other deputy senior investigators and investigators. We
10		had to, within a short period of time, try and create
11		processes to aiming towards 1 April when we would
12		obviously go live and have to respond to any immediate
13		serious incidents. So it was a matter of preparing for
14		that, a variety of things, even administrative stuff and
15		getting our then office in Paisley up to scratch, to be
16		able to work effectively from that location.
17	Q.	We have heard there is evidence available to the
18		Chair in statements, I should say, that your office was
19		in Hamilton. Initially was it in Paisley and did it
20		move to Hamilton?
21	Α.	Yes, we were only at Paisley for quite a short period of
22		time and then we moved to basically our current
23		location.
24	Q.	I would like you to look at document please, which
25		I understand was from November 2012. So prior to you

1		starting, prior to PIRC's creation but I would like to
2		see if you recognise it. It is PIRC 04446. You will
3		see there the date is Monday, 12 November 2012, and it
4		is headed up:
5		"Police Investigations and Review Commissioner."
6		So PIRC:
7		"Operational model.
8		"Response to Article 2 investigations."
9		Do you recognise this document?
10	Α.	No, I don't. That is not to say I haven't seen it,
11		obviously it is a long time ago but at this point
12		I don't I don't recognise it.
13	Q.	We may hear evidence from John Mitchell, the director,
14		later in the hearing and he may say that this document
15		formed quite a bit of discussion in the run-up to
16		1 April 2013. So it was being discussed
17	Α.	Yes, I wouldn't dispute that. Obviously we were, as
18		I say, in preparation for that effectively that
19		launch date and there would be a lot of dialogue at
20		different stages and we were all given different tasks
21		to formulate some of these process and move towards that
22		date.
23	Q.	Thank you. Let's look at page 2 of that document, and
24		see if this refreshes your memory. You see it is headed
25		up PIRC:

1 "Operational model -- response to Article 2 investigations." 2 3 It says: "This operational guidance document reflects the 4 5 development of ECHR case law in respect of the implications of Article 2 along with the requirement for 6 7 the independent investigation of those cases where Article 2 may be engaged." 8 9 Then if we look down to paragraph 5 it says: 10 "The Human Rights Act 1998 and obligation imposed under Article 2 apply equally to [Police Service of 11 12 Scotland], [Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service] 13 and PIRC. Where Article 2 is engaged, the 14 Police Service have a duty to ensure that they conduct 15 themselves in a manner that is consistent with the five procedural obligation that is the courts have held to 16 17 exist." 18 Does this ring a bell for you? 19 Vaguely I think. But as I say that is ... Α. 20 Do you remember seeing this document before or when you Q. 21 arrived at PIRC, before they came into existence? 22 Not specifically that document but these are certainly Α. 23 discussions, I think, that would take place as part of that initial planning. 24 Was the independence of PIRC known to you, the 25 Q.

1		importance of PIRC being independent?
2	A.	Absolutely, yes. Highly important in the role that we
3		were taking on.
4	Q.	In fact was that part of the reason PIRC were set up, to
5		be independent and conduct independent investigations?
6	A.	That is the main reason, I would say.
7	Q.	Then let's look at these five procedural obligations.
8		You see the bullet points there. The first is:
9		"The investigation must be independent insofar as it
10		should have no hierarchical or institutional connection
11		to those implicated."
12		And that is in bold?
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	Do you understand what that means?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	Can you explain that to people listening?
17	A.	Basically you can't be classed as independent if
18		potentially your position with the Inquiry that you are
19		conducting could be compromised or negatively affected
20		by what you are doing through relationships or other
21		ties with individuals.
22		So it is clear that you must be wholly independent
23		with any investigation that you are doing, if you are
24		not in a position to do that, then you would have to
25		declare that and withdraw, and that was the same for

1		every member of staff. That is still at the forefront
2		today of any investigation that we conduct, to ensure
3		that that is present.
4	Q.	We have heard evidence about Police Scotland being
5		a hierarchical organisation and officers of different
6		ranks within that organisation. Can I ask, was it
7		important to investigators with PIRC not to be
8		intimidated or bowed by senior officers in the
9		Police Service?
10	Α.	Absolutely, and that is clearly a part of the
11		independence as well, that couldn't be the case under
12		any circumstances.
13	Q.	Where it says "institutional connection", was that what
14		you were saying a moment ago about
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	a connection between the organisations.
17	Α.	Obviously, I mean some members of staff were previously
18		affiliated, employed by what was previously the forces
19		within the newly created Police Scotland, so again it
20		was important to recognise that and make sure that that
21		didn't adversely affect any investigation that we were
22		doing.
23	Q.	Then the second bullet point there is:
24		"The investigation must be effective."
25		That is also in bold. What did you understand that

to mean? 1 Yes, it's clear that from start to finish the 2 Α. 3 investigation must be professional, it must be 4 effective, come to sound conclusions and findings within 5 that investigation. And using all the necessary skills of the individuals involved to ensure that that is 6 7 an effective investigation. Q. Then there are three further bullet points there. They 8 are not in bold but they say: 9 10 "The investigation must be reasonably prompt." 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. And what did you understand that to mean? 13 Yes, I mean that is part of being effective, I would Α. 14 say, that you take on the investigation and progress 15 that as soon as reasonably practical depending on the complexities that involved. I mean, some investigations 16 17 we do do take a long time but there are sound reasons 18 for that. 19 Then it says: Q. 20 "There must be a sufficient element of public 21 scrutiny." What did that mean? 22 I think a lot of investigations that we do are published 23 Α. 24 into the public environment so there is a knowledge of investigations that we are conducting and we have to 25

1		promote confidence in the organisation itself, so that
2		means the wider public will have an awareness of what we
3		are doing, and hopefully have confidence in that.
4	Q.	And:
5		"The next of kin must be involved to an appropriate
6		extent."
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	What did you understand that to mean?
9	Α.	I would think that was particularly relevant to death
10		investigations obviously, that the family were looked
11		after properly, were kept informed of appropriate
12		information and were given all necessary support at the
13		required times.
14	Q.	It goes on to say:
15		"So far as this document is concerned it is the
16		first two obligations that are will relevant and which
17		must be observed by the [Police Service of Scotland] and
18		PIRC under direction of [the Crown Office]. In those
19		cases where Article 2 may be engaged the PIRC will seek
20		to deploy Investigators at the earliest opportunity to
21		enable the conduct of an independent investigation."
22		Having looked at that, where it said in the first
23		section that I read out that Article 2 obligations apply

equally to the police, the Crown and PIRC, and they have

these five procedural obligations which we have gone

24 25

1		through, but then says it's the first two that are
2		relevant and must be observed by the police, PIRC and
3		Crown Office. Can I just be clear, were all five, in
4		your understanding, applicable to the police and PIRC
5		and the Crown?
6	Α.	I would say so, yes. It certainly would be to me,
7		leading any investigation.
8	Q.	So, as an investigator with the PIRC, you would take the
9		view that all five should be observed
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	as part of your investigation? Thank you.
12		Just for completeness, can we have a look at page 4,
13		please. This relates to, "Assistance and cooperation of
14		police resources", and if we see the section that is
15		highlighted in bold, paragraph 3, there is:
16		"The Regulations for Investigation require the
17		Chief Constable and the \dots (SPA) to provide such
18		facilities, assistance and cooperation as the PIRC may
19		request for the purpose of, or in connection with,
20		an investigation."
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	So was it envisioned that the police would we have
23		heard evidence that the police would continue to provide
24		resources and make those resources and support available
25		to PIRC.

1 Α. Yes. Was that envisaged to be part of your investigation? 2 Q. On some occasions, yes, I don't think it is always 3 Α. 4 necessary but certainly the bigger, or the more complex, 5 there may be a requirement to utilise and direct police resources at certain times for certain functions. 6 7 So the situation is the PIRC may make a request? Q. 8 Α. Yes. It's not compulsory? 9 Q. 10 Α. No, we don't necessarily have to, no. The final paragraph on page 4, please. So: 11 Q. 12 "Upon receipt of a referral it may be necessary to 13 require cooperation from police resources to carry out 14 tasks that the PIRC feels are reasonable and 15 appropriate. The PIRC Investigator will confer with the appointed police senior officer at the time of initial 16 17 contact and deployment where it has been necessary to deploy. During those early discussions it may be 18 19 necessary to secure the use of police resources to carry 20 out tasks required by PIRC staff. These considerations 21 are not exhaustive and are produced to assist [Police Service] and PIRC staff, they are not meant to 22 infer that the police will resist PIRC involvement." 23 24 So again, it is reinforcing that it's an option for PIRC to make a request of the police, and if PIRC makes 25

1 such a request, what were your expectations of the 2 police? A. That they would agree to do that, and I would expect 3 4 that on every occasion. And it would be more important 5 in the very early stages of a major investigation that there would be a need to -- you know, to utilise 6 7 resources for certain tasks, but still under our direction. 8 Q. Let's look at page 5, please. This is headed, 9 "Providing the direction that officers should not confer 10 prior to recording their first account." 11 12 It says: 13 "The issue surrounding officers being allowed to 14 confer following an incident and in particular 15 a firearms incident, has been a contentious one." So there was a recognition that this had caused some 16 17 issue. I won't go through all of those paragraphs in detail but if we can go down the page, there is 18 a reference to an ACPO manual, and we see 19 20 paragraph 7.94: 21 "As a matter of general practice officers should not 22 confer with others before making their accounts (whether initial or subsequent accounts). The important issue is 23 to individually record what their honestly held belief 24

of the situation was at the time force was used. There

25

should be no need for an officer to confer with others 1 about what was in their mind at the time force was used. 2 3 If, however, in a particular case a need to confer on 4 other issues does arise then, in order to ensure 5 transparency and maintain public confidence, where some discussion has taken place, officers must document the 6 7 fact that conferring has taken place, highlighting ... " There are four bullet points: 8 9 "Time, date and place where conferring took place. "The issues discussed. 10 "With whom. 11 12 "The reasons for such discussion." 13 Α. Yes. Again, this reflects back here to ensuring transparency 14 Q. 15 and maintaining public confidence. Again, that is supporting the Article 2 requirements to ensure that 16 17 your investigation complies with Article 2. Is that 18 correct? 19 Yes. Α. Thank you. Can we look at page 8 now, please. I am 20 Q. 21 interested in the, "Additional advice for staff", which 22 is halfway down that page. The first paragraph there: "If the indications are that the guidance is not 23 going to be complied with we should explain to officers 24 that, in relation to the use of lethal force they should 25

1		record their honestly held belief why they used the
2		force and we should make it clear that conferring is not
3		necessary when recording their own belief. We must be
4		clear that we are not seeking for officers to be
5		separated and we understand that they are entitled to
6		legal advice."
7		So when there is a reference there to "we", that is
8		to PIRC, is it?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And when it says:
11		" we should explain to officers that, in relation
12		to the use of lethal force they should record their
13		honestly held belief~"
14		What was envisaged when it said, "We should explain
15		to officers"?
16	A.	I would expect that that is whoever is leading the
17		investigation at that time would would articulate
18		that to the officers. Now, I note it refers
19		specifically to lethal force which I think this looks to
20		be directing more towards the kind of firearms-type,
21		where a firearm is discharged and someone was
22		subsequently killed.
23	Q.	All right. Let's look at page 7 because this does say
24		at the top of page 7:
25		"PIRC investigators guidance note.

1		"Referrals involving the police use of firearms."
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	It relates to Article 2 investigations. We will come
4		back to this. Thank you.
5	A.	I think this refers specifically to the kind of
6		post-incident process, which I assume you will go into
7		at a later stage. But it is linked to that, and there
8		would be a requirement for us in that situation in
9		relation to a firearms, at that time in 2015, to follow
10		a process.
11	Q.	So your understanding of this section is that it would
12		relate to a firearms situation?
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	What did you understand a firearm to be, in 2015?
15	A.	What would my definition of a firearm be?
16	Q.	Well, what was your understanding?
17	A.	I would say a lethal barrelled weapon of any
18		description.
19	Q.	All right. Thank you. When you became involved with
20		the death of Sheku Bayoh and the investigation into that
21		by PIRC
22	A.	Yes.
23	Q.	was this document something that you had regard to or
24		had in the back of your mind?
25	Α.	No, I couldn't say that, not specifically, no.

1	Q.	I would like to look at another document now. This is
2		after PIRC came into existence in April 2013, but before
3		the incident in May 2015. So during that period. Could
4		we look at PIRC 04453, please. You will see this is
5		headed:
6		"Memorandum of understanding between the Crown
7		Office and PIRC."
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	You do recognise this document?
10	Α.	I would be aware of its existence, yes.
11	Q.	Would you have read it at the time?
12	Α.	At the time probably I would expect so, yes.
13	Q.	Can we have a look at page 2. You will see if we can
14		go up a bit, please. Thank you. We will see that it
15		says:
16		"PIRC statutory responsibilities."
17		I am hoping you can help us understand something in
18		relation to the statutory responsibilities. It says
19		there:
20		"Section 33A of the 2006 Act details the general
21		functions of the Commissioner~"
22		Of PIRC, and then if we look at section (b):
23		"Where directed to do so by the appropriate
24		prosecutor -
25		"(i) to investigate any circumstances in which there

1		is an indication that a person serving with the police
2		may have committed an offence."
3		That will be a criminal offence?
4	A.	Criminal offence, yes.
5	Q.	So that is (b)(i), if I can call it that?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	Then let's look on to the next page, and we will see
8		(b)(ii) and this is:
9		"to investigate, on behalf of the relevant
10		procurator fiscal, the circumstances of any death
11		involving a person serving with the police which that
12		procurator fiscal is required to investigate under
13		section 1 of the Fatal Accidents Act~"
14		Now, can you explain to everyone what that
15		distinction meant in day-to-day work for PIRC
16		investigators?
17	Α.	It is two completely different referrals from the Crown
18		Office. The first one in relation to a specific
19		criminal allegation would come from the Criminal
20		Allegations Against Police division of Crown Office, and
21		in relation to any death would come from a different
22		area of business at Crown. So there are two very
23		different referrals requiring a different response and
24		different legal framework in relation to the people that
25		are involved in that.

1	Q.	So they are both involving some sort of contact with the
2		police, an investigation which has to be conducted by
3		PIRC, one relates to a criminal allegation?
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	And one where there has been a death involving someone
6		in the police but not necessarily a criminal allegation
7		at the outset?
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	And it is a different legal framework and a different
10		format?
11	A.	Yes, it's obviously a very different approach on how you
12		do that.
13	Q.	Can you explain to people when you say there is
14		a different approach, what the different approaches
15		taken were?
16	A.	As far as a criminal allegation, then at the early stage
17		you may know who the allegation is against, what officer
18		or member of police staff it is against, or you may not.
19		So you would have to progress to establish who the
20		allegation is against and obviously the individual
21		officers would have their own rights as a suspect for
22		a criminal allegation under the law. Whereas for
23		a death investigation then unless the circumstances
24		change significantly during the course of that, then any
25		of the police officers or members of police staff are

1		likely to be witnesses, as I say, along the line, unless
2		the evidence told us something different that we accrue
3		during the course of the investigation.
4	Q.	So under (b)(i) there is some sort of knowledge or
5		awareness or evidence that the police officer is
6		immediately a suspect in allegations of criminal
7		behaviour.
8	Α.	Yes, although we may not know who that suspect is at the
9		initial stages of it and that may be identified during
10		the course of an investigation.
11	Q.	But some police officer perhaps unidentified at that
12		point
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	there is evidence that a criminal act has taken
15		place?
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	So when you do identify that person they are immediately
18		a suspect?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	And (b)(ii) is a different type of investigation where
21		it may or may not end up in criminal proceedings being
22		taken. You are looking into the circumstances of that?
23	A.	Yes, and following distinct terms of reference from
24		Crown in relation to what they want us to investigate.
25	Q.	Are you following distinct terms of reference from the

1		Crown for both, whether it's (b)(i) or (b)(ii) or just
2		in (b)(ii)
3	A.	No, mainly in (b)(ii). I would say, there may be some
4		form of direction with (b)(i) but it would be likely
5		that we would be told what the allegation is, then we
6		would conduct the investigation without little or no
7		consultation during the course of that, just depending
8		on that could be different, but normally that would
9		be the way it would work.
10	Q.	So (b)(ii), the police officers, if they are involved,
11		they are not suspects, they are witnesses at that stage?
12	A.	At that stage. Unless there is something to point to
13		a different outcome.
14	Q.	As you conduct your investigation that position may
15		change?
16	A.	It could do, yes.
17	Q.	We have heard some evidence that as the position if
18		it does change, then the status of the officer may also
19		change?
20	A.	May change, yes.
21	Q.	That is really a wider investigation into circumstances,
22		not necessarily criminal, and you are relying on the
23		terms of reference from the Crown Office?
24	A.	Yes.
25	Q.	Thank you.

1 Can we look briefly at page 4. Do we see that the memorandum of understanding then sets out, "Role of the 2 PIRC in investigations". At section 5.2 it says: 3 4 "During the course of an investigation PIRC 5 investigators will have the powers of a constable." 6 Yes. Α. 7 Q. There is a statement available to the Chair which says although PIRC investigators have the same powers as 8 9 a constable, those powers fly off when they are not at 10 work; is that accurate? Correct. And although they have the same powers 11 Α. 12 effectively they don't have the same powers even when 13 they are working in relation to members of the public. 14 That is where there is -- the line is drawn and the 15 distinction is. Right. What does -- how does that impact the action of 16 Q. 17 PIRC investigators if they don't have those same powers in relation to the public, what does that mean in 18 19 practical terms? In practical terms they couldn't arrest a member of the 20 Α. 21 public, they couldn't report them for a criminal act. 22 If there were issues with members of the public during a specific investigation then that may be one of the 23 occasions we have to seek the support of the police to 24 deal with that aspect of it. 25

1	Q.	When you say report them, you mean send a report to the
2		Crown Office
3	Α.	Yes, report to Crown in relation to a criminal
4		allegation.
5	Q.	5.3 explains:
6		"The PIRC is independent from any policing body
7		operating within Scotland."
8		And then at 5.5, do we see it says:
9		"PIRC investigations are intend to comply with the
10		five principles of effective investigation outlined by
11		ECHR [European Convention on Human Rights] namely;
12		independence, adequacy, promptness and so far as
13		possible public scrutiny and victim involvement."
14		Is this effectively the five principles that we
15		talked about
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	and we saw in the previous document? So the
18		intention is that PIRC investigations will comply with
19		those five principles?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	Can we look at page 5, please. I am interested in
22		paragraph 7.4. So this is during an investigation, it
23		says:
24		"In the case of a death investigation, the police
25		will be required to submit the initial death report by

1		the next working day to the Scottish Fatalities
2		Investigation Unit of [Crown Office]. The PIRC will
3		submit its full death report into the investigation of
4		the death within timescales determined by COPFS in each
5		individual case."
6		Can I ask you, we may hear evidence later of
7		something called a sudden death report. Is that
8		the same thing as this initial death report that we see
9		here?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	So if someone later says "sudden death report" or "SDR",
12		that would be the same thing they are talking about?
13	A.	Yes. That is purely, as it says there, a police
14		function to they have a requirement to submit that
15		timeously to the fatalities unit.
16	Q.	Timeously means the police submit the report by the next
17		working day?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	And that is to a department within Crown Office?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	Thank you. Is that normal in any death investigation?
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	Would that be your expectation as a PIRC investigator?
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	Would that normally be done?

1 Α. Yes. Thank you. That is great. I would like you to look at 2 Q. 3 another document for me and this is PIRC 04438. There 4 is no date on this document but the Inquiry has been 5 advised that it was dated 17 June 2014. So again we are still looking at a period prior to May 2015 --6 7 Α. Yes. Q. -- in regard to the Sheku Bayoh investigation. But 8 9 I wonder if you recognise this document. It says: 10 "PIRC independent investigative processes following police use of firearms." 11 12 Do you recognise this? 13 No, but again it is something I would expect to be Α. 14 there. As I say I don't have that recollection dating 15 back to then but again this would be -- it's a major part of PIRC business would be a serious firearms 16 17 incident, so I would expect that document to be there 18 and with the relevant content and direction and process, 19 etc, contained within that. 20 Would you expect to have read this --Q. 21 Α. Yes. -- when it came out, and to be familiar with it? 22 Q. 23 Α. Yes. Q. We see that this has been -- this paper has been 24 produced to take cognisance of a report by an assistant 25

1		coroner in May of that year in respect of the shooting
2		of Mark Duggan by the Metropolitan Police, and I think
3		this was a high profile shooting
4	A.	Yes, it was.
5	Q.	at that time. It says:
6		"The purpose of this document is to identify
7		learning opportunities and give clear guidance of what
8		it expected of the PIRC Investigation Team following
9		such a shooting by officers of Police Scotland."
10		We have heard quite a lot of evidence about whether
11		there were similar learning opportunities in
12		Police Scotland where there has been high profile death
13		and investigation down south, and whether there were
14		learning opportunities in Scotland from those incidents.
15		Is this something that PIRC were doing at the time,
16		learning lessons from other high profile incidents?
17	A.	I think we may have taken the likes of the
18		preparation of these documents, they may have taken
19		that. Whether they were proactively looking at a number
20		of investigations from down south, I am unable to answer
21		that. I don't know.
22	Q.	Can we look at the "Investigative function" section. So
23		if we can go up the page a little:
24		"In the initial stages following the discharge of
25		a police firearm, Police Scotland must in line with the

1 European Convention on Human Rights ... Article 2, take all appropriate steps to reduce any possible risks of 2 3 the investigation being undermined by any 4 deficiencies ..." So again we are seeing reference here to Article 2. 5 Was this something that was given significant priority 6 7 and focus in PIRC? Very much so, a high priority. 8 Α. It goes on to say they want to avoid deficiencies: 9 Q. "... such as failing to secure all available 10 evidence. Procedures adopted should be designed to 11 12 demonstrate integrity of purpose in all actions and 13 discussions between the officers involved and be able to 14 withstand scrutiny." 15 And it says: "The responsibility for securing evidence and taking 16 17 appropriate action in an Article 2 investigation remains with Police Scotland until such time as the PIRC has 18 taken over conduct of the investigation." 19 20 So again, this document at least envisaged the 21 police initially taking the initial investigatory steps? 22 Yes, that is just outlining the practicalities of, you Α. know, something happening, something very serious, where 23 it is geographically and what is the realistic response, 24 time and effort by us as an organisation. So whatever 25

1		that shortfall in the responsibility will initially lie
2		because the police are the first responders to
3		an incident like that.
4	Q.	So in any incident before PIRC has taken over conduct of
5		the investigation, the police will be involved during
6		that initial period?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	Where it says, "PIRC has taken over conduct of the
9		investigation", what did that actually mean? When do
10		PIRC take over conduct of the investigation? Can you
11		explain to us
12	Α.	I don't know about conduct, I would say responsibility
13		for it, and as soon as any death is referred to us then
14		I would say we have that immediate responsibility,
15		although effectively on the ground Police Scotland are
16		still running with certain matters, there is no way
17		round that, that still has it happen. But we would, you
18		know, start communication right away with the
19		appropriate people, and make ourselves known and direct
20		accordingly, even from afar.
21	Q.	So when you say as soon as you are informed of the
22		death
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	does that mean PIRC have immediate responsibility for
25		the investigation?

1	Α.	I would say so. That would be how I would interpret it,
2		as soon as I make first contact with Police Scotland,
3		representatives or other organisation.
4	Q.	We have heard that there might be an initial call from
5		the Crown to PIRC?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	Would that saying, "We want you to get involved and
8		conduct an investigation"?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And we have also heard there might be conversations
11		between PIRC and the senior investigating officer or
12		SIO?
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	At what point would you say PIRC have taken over conduct
15		or taken immediate responsibility; would it be when they
16		speak to the Crown or when they speak to the police?
17	Α.	Effectively we have been given that responsibility from
18		Crown so that starts from then, but for us to have
19		control over it and start directing things we obviously
20		need to speak to the first senior officer from
21		Police Scotland, who in this instance was the SIO. So
22		from my perspective, as soon as I speak to him I am
23		issuing some sort of directions once I get a briefing of
24		what has occurred and that started from that first
25		telephone conversation.

1	Q.	So, taking over responsibility doesn't involve you being
2		present at the scene or present in the office?
3	Α.	No, that is not necessary.
4	Q.	It is that
5	Α.	Obviously it's a preference, but again it is down to
6		practicalities and moving from that initial contact on
7		call with direction from Crown to then influencing and
8		directing what is going on thereafter.
9	Q.	That starts when you are making the call
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	to the SIO?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	And having received that call from the Crown Office?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	Thank you. We have heard evidence about there being
16		a formal process known as a handover. So a sort of
17		conversation where or a discussion between the police
18		and PIRC where information and an update is given to
19		PIRC. We have heard about formal handovers. In terms
20		of your responsibility for an investigation, to what
21		extent does the handover provide you with the
22		information you need or allow that investigation to
23		commence?
24	Α.	I would say that description to me, the formal
25		handover is when we get the investigation, so that has

1 already occurred. I understand how that phraseology is 2 used because it's more a briefing -- a more detailed 3 briefing than what we would possibly have had before, 4 but certainly we would go over information that had 5 already been articulated to me but maybe in more detail or there may have been additional developments during 6 7 that timeframe, but that is not a formal handover of the investigative function to PIRC at that time, because 8 that has already occurred and we have that already. 9 10 Q. So you have already got the responsibility --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- and the control, but the formal briefing is more of 13 an update or a --I would say so. There may be new information within 14 Α. 15 that, there may be an expansion on what we have had 16 before. And again, it just makes common sense because, 17 you know, to some extent we are still acting 18 collaboratively at that time because there are other 19 strands to the investigation that are ongoing, so we 20 have to keep communicating and being up-to-date so that 21 we can make the appropriate decisions on how we 22 prioritise the investigation at that stage, what we have 23 to do. Q. From the PIRC perspective, how important is that 24

25

handover from Police Scotland?

1	Α.	The formal one that you described or
2	Q.	Yes.
3	A.	It is very important. All briefings are very important,
4		particularly where there's key individuals that are
5		leading the individual teams.
6	Q.	You were lead investigator on 3 May 2015 in relation to
7		the death of Sheku Bayoh?
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	Am I right in saying you were the first PIRC
10		investigator to arrive in Kirkcaldy Police Office?
11	Α.	We arrived as a group.
12	Q.	As a group?
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	How many were in your group?
15	A.	Six.
16	Q.	You were the one in charge?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	I think in your second statement, SBPI00382
19		I couldn't find the number for this earlier so let me
20		just take a moment to go through this with you.
21		So this is headed up:
22		"Statement in response to Rule 8 request by
23		Sheku Bayoh Public Inquiry."
24		And it looks slime different from your first Inquiry
25		statement but this was in response to some numbered

1		questions that we sent you.
	_	
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	And you then responded in writing with the assistance
4	Α.	I did.
5	Q.	of maybe your legal team or whoever. So if you don't
6		mind, I will call this your second Inquiry statement
7		because it is through the Inquiry that we obtained this.
8	A.	Fine.
9	Q.	It is dated 27 September 2023. If we can look at the
10		last page, please. You will see at the bottom there is
11		a block redacted, can we move up, please. And am
12		I right in saying you have signed this document?
13	A.	I did.
14	Q.	In the way you had signed your first statement?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	And it was signed on 13 October 2023?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	A similar, if not the same, paragraph appears at the
19		end:
20		"I believe the facts stated in this witness
21		statement are true. I understand that this statement
22		may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be
23		published on the Inquiry's website."
24	A.	Yes.
25	Q.	And you understood that to be the case when you signed?

1 A. I did.

2	Q.	Can we look at paragraph 52, please. Again, you should
3		have a hard copy of this in your blue folder. You were
4		asked if there was an effective and successful handover
5		of responsibility for the investigation from
6		Police Scotland to PIRC on 3 May and you say:
7		"I am satisfied that the handover was effective
8		and successful."
9		I think the way the question is phrased is that
10		effectively this handover transferred responsibility to
11		PIRC but from what you have said you already had the
12		responsibility
13	A.	Yes, and
14	Q.	through the contact with
15	A.	Very much.
16	Q.	the Crown Office and the contact with the SIO?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	So it wasn't that handover as such that gave you the
19		authority and the responsibility for the investigation?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	Thank you. You thought but in any event you thought
22		handover was effective and successful?
23	Α.	Yes, I mean there was significant communication with
24		Detective Superintendent Campbell at that early stage
25		

1 on the 3 May.

2	Q.	We will come back to that in a moment. Can we go back
3		to PIRC 04438, please. So this was the PIRC independent
4		investigative processes following police use of
5		firearms, we were looking at this document a moment ago.
6		I wonder if we could look at more than halfway down the
7		page, I have just been talking to you about when PIRC
8		take over the conduct of the investigation. Can we look
9		at the section, "Police Scotland use of firearms", and
10		it says:
11		"Police use of a firearm can be defined as"
12		There are four bullet points there:
13		"Discharge of a firearm.
14		"Presentation of a firearm at a person.
15		"Discharge of a Taser.
16		"Discharge of CS gas."
17		Were you aware that discharge of CS gas could be
18		classed as a firearm at that time?
19	Α.	Yes. It comes they come routinely to PIRC as
20		referrals, quite a significant number of them, as do
21		Taser discharge as well.
22	Q.	We have heard evidence that from 1 April 2013 there was
23		a legal obligation on officers, if they had discharged
24		their CS canister of CS gas, that they had a legal
25		obligation of completing a use of spray form which would

1		then come direct to PIRC. Is that correct?
2	A.	Yes. I think the police did, I don't think necessarily
3		the individual officer, although it would be on most
4		occasions. But that could come from a colleague for
5		whatever
6	Q.	It could have been
7	Α.	specific reason.
8	Q.	from a sergeant?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	We have also heard the evidence it could have been from
11		a line manager, a sergeant
12	A.	Invariably it's the officer themselves that would
13		complete that form.
14	Q.	So when PIRC are dealing with an incident involving
15		discharge of CS gas, would you understand that this
16		document, although it says firearms, would incorporate
17		discharge of a CS gas canister?
18	A.	Yes, or PAVA spray as it is probably more common now.
19	Q.	We have heard evidence that in 2015 it was moving from
20		CS to PAVA; would that be your recollection?
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	So we have a statement from John Mitchell, we have not
23		actually heard his evidence yet, in relation to this
24		document, that he says he firmly believed that in terms
25		of post-incident management that this document was

1 transferable, it didn't just relate to guns, that it 2 would also relate to discharge of sprays. Would you 3 agree with that? 4 Α. I would -- well, certainly there but I think everything 5 you have showed me is more, I think, determined or in relation to that use of four -- discharge of a firearm, 6 that these processes are specifically targeted towards 7 that. I can see obviously it refers to CS and Taser 8 within that. 9 10 Q. So if John Mitchell in his statement says although it 11 related, this document, to police use of firearms, it 12 could equally relate to an investigation into a death in 13 police custody which did not involve firearms; was that 14 your understanding at the time or not? 15 I think in practical terms the approach to a discharge Α. of firearms which resulted in a fatality was different 16 17 at that time from how a death would be dealt with. 18 Obviously that has changed significantly over the last 19 few years, not long after this incident occurred there 20 was a process of change towards -- which really brought both these types of incidents together as far as how 21 22 that response would be done by both ourselves and the 23 police. 24 Q. Can we look at page 2 of this document. I will go through this quite quickly. It says: 25

1		"Initial PIRC response to an incident whereby
2		Police Scotland discharge firearm causing serious
3		injury/death."
4		And it says:
5		"Police Scotland will immediately notify the Crown
6		Office and PIRC and the Crown Office will determine the
7		mode of investigation. Police Scotland will appoint
8		an initial investigating officer and continue to
9		preserve the scene until PIRC is directed by Crown
10		Office to assume primacy for the investigation including
11		the scene and conduct an independent investigation into
12		the circumstances of the firearms discharge or
13		shooting."
14		The initial investigating officer, would that be the
15		same as the SIO?
16	A.	No.
17	Q.	No?
18	A.	No.
19	Q.	Who would be the initial investigating officer?
20	A.	It would be a senior officer in that geographical area
21		that would take firm responsibility for that, but if it
22		was a critical incident like that then an SIO would be
23		appointed very quickly.
24	Q.	Then it sets out information on the PIRC investigation.
25		Starts with the scene and assuming overall control.

1 There is reference there to the impact of geographical location and the time it might take effectively for PIRC 2 3 to actually get to the area from Hamilton. So we deal 4 with that. PIRC scene manager is also dealt with. We 5 will come back to the detail of this later, PIRC productions officer, on the next page. There is a role 6 7 called a scribe. Can you tell us what that role is? It would be just someone dedicated to taking notes to 8 Α. 9 support the lead investigator. I effectively did that 10 on the day and appointed somebody to do that on my behalf just to support the notes that I was taking, just 11 12 to make sure nothing was missed. 13 Again, is this designed to enhance transparency and Q. 14 public confidence in what is being done? 15 Α. That is part of it. But it is just making sure that we can record as much relevant and important information as 16 17 we can in what is a really fast flowing incident, most of these things. So there is a lot going on a lot to 18 try and recall and note to use potentially later. 19 20 Is that someone that assists you and supports you in Q. 21 your role as lead investigator? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Q. And then it says: 24 "PIRC investigation at the post-incident management (PIM) suite." 25

1 And it says: "The PIRC Senior Investigator attending at the scene 2 3 will deploy a Post-Incident Management ... aware member 4 of PIRC staff to the Police Scotland Post-Incident 5 Management Suite." What did it mean a post-incident management-aware 6 7 member of PIRC staff? A. Somebody that had undergone awareness training in 8 9 relation to the Police Scotland post-incident process, so we had a limited number of officers at that time that 10 were trained in that process, formal training, as it 11 12 were. And then I never underwent that training but 13 I had awareness of the processes as far as the roles of 14 different people, from the post-incident manager to our 15 own staff, as regards their role within the post-incident process. 16 Q. Then it says: 17 "Police Scotland has six PIM suites~..." 18 19 And it gives the various locations. And there is 20 one in the east, in Edinburgh. Do you -- did you have 21 an awareness of the PIM suites --22 Α. Yes. Q. -- and the availability of those as part of --23 Yes, and they were obviously spread geographically to be 24 Α. within reasonable distance for an incident occurring in 25

1

any part of Scotland.

2 Is this something that you had -- was it available for Q. 3 your use as part of an investigation or was --4 Α. The post-incident process is a police process where the 5 PIRC investigators have specific roles to play within that. So Police Scotland would initiate the 6 7 post-incident process. We should be made aware of that at a very early stage so that we can then deploy 8 9 appropriate resources and seniority to the PIM suite to 10 whatever the incident scenes we have, so that we can cover all aspects of it. And there can be occasions 11 12 where there is more than one post-incident process ongoing for an incident. Certainly on a few occasions 13 14 we have had two at the one time at different locations 15 for the same incident. In terms of using a suite or the availability of 16 Q. 17 a suite, is that under the control of Police Scotland? 18 Α. Yes. 19 When you say PIRC should be made aware of that? Q. 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. How would PIRC be made aware of the use of a PIM suite? 22 Officially we would anticipate it would be the Α. Professional Standards department, one of the senior 23 officers that would give us early notice that the 24 post-incident process was going to commence, where it 25

1 was, any other practical information as regards how many 2 officers, members of police staff, are involved in that, 3 was there more than one, which is very important because 4 that can obviously cause issues and we need additional 5 resources to cover all these aspects of it. When you say "early notice", can you help us understand 6 Q. 7 what that means? How early is early? Once a decision is made by a senior officer within 8 Α. 9 Police Scotland that that post-incident process is going 10 to commence, I would hope that we would be the next phone call to say: this is happening and we will keep 11 12 you up-to-date, as it moves towards that formal process 13 starting. In 2015 would that have been the normal procedure for 14 Q. 15 you to receive a phone call from a senior officer? 16 At any time, yes. From -- yes, and particularly more Α. recently, I mean these are -- now have -- for a few 17 18 years have been common place now, for post-incident 19 processes to take place. They weren't nearly as common at that time. 20 21 We have heard evidence that in 2015 not everyone had Q. 22 been trained in post-incident procedures. So some officers maybe weren't as familiar with post-incident --23 24 Α. Yes, I agree with that. 25 Q. Do you agree with that? How common was it in 2015 for

1		PIRC to receive that phone call?
2	Α.	Not very, for a post-incident process, no.
3	Q.	Was there that type of phone call on 3 May to you about
4		post-incident procedure?
5	Α.	No. I was never formally aware that a post-incident
6		process was considered or a decision made to commence
7		it.
8	Q.	When you say you weren't formally made aware, what would
9		you have expected, would it have been the phone call you
10		have just been describing?
11	Α.	I would have expected within the conversations that
12		I had with the senior police officers, whether it be by
13		telephone or personally face-to-face at a later stage,
14		that I was formally made aware that that process was
15		occurring.
16	Q.	When did you become aware that we have heard evidence
17		from Conrad Trickett, who was appointed, as
18		we understand, on as post-incident manager on 3 May.
19		When did you become aware that Conrad Trickett had been
20		appointed as post-incident manager?
21	Α.	Not on 3 May.
22	Q.	Not that day?
23	Α.	No. I was made aware that he was carrying out
24		a function as welfare and support for the officers, no
25		more than that.

1	Q.	Who made you aware of that?
2	Α.	I I think it was probably at the first either at
3		the Gold Group meeting or the first one I attended,
4		or prior to that.
5	Q.	Do you remember who told you?
6	Α.	No, I'm afraid not. Unless there is reference to it in
7		one of my statements, but I don't think so.
8	Q.	You have described that as being told about he was
9		performing a welfare and support for officers role?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Was there any mention that this was akin to
12		post-incident manager
13	Α.	No.
14	Q.	or any mention of post-incident procedures?
15	Α.	No. As I said, I think I mentioned in my statement that
16		the various aspects of the post-incident process, very
17		little or none of those actually took place anyway so
18		that kind of supports that position that, you know, as
19		far as I was aware there was no post-incident process
20		per se was taking place. Because there were different
21		stages, obviously, and there would have been accounts
22		from the officers in relation to the incident if that
23		was the case.
24	Q.	So in the absence of being of receiving that
25		intimation that there was a post-incident procedure and

1 a post-incident manager in place in terms of the document that we have been looking at, did you appoint 2 3 a PIM-aware investigator? 4 Α. No. 5 Q. No. Then can we look at the final page, it refers to conferring again. Keep going, please. And again, there 6 7 is a reference to: "As a matter of general practice, Police ... 8 9 Officers should not confer with each other before making their accounts (initial or otherwise). There should be 10 11 no need for an officer to confer ... about what was in their mind at the time force was used." 12 13 So this section appears again. And then towards the bottom of that page it says, final paragraph: 14 15 "The Police Scotland PIM manager should have reminded the officers involved in relation to 16 17 conferring. The PIRC PIM Aware Investigator should ensure that this has been done and document/record when 18 19 asked of the Police Scotland PIM manager and note 20 his/her reply." 21 But on 3 May 2015 there was no PIM-aware investigator at that time? 22 23 A. No. Q. Then it says: 24 "Minimum deployment of PIRC personnel." 25

1	Α.	Sorry, I was PIM-aware. Although I had not gone on
2		a formal course, I was aware of the processes, and if it
3		had been you know a firearms incident, you know, these
4		particular roles would have been filled and that part of
5		the process would have taken place.
6	Q.	So had you been aware there was post-incident procedure
7		in place with a manager, would you have been able to
8		fulfil this task
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	of the PIRC PIM-aware investigator?
11	Α.	Yes, or potentially somebody else who we appointed and
12		that may have changed~ Ricky Casey, the
13		senior investigator, was PIM trained, and was obviously
14		part of the on-call team that day. So that you know
15		if this formal process had kicked in, then, you know, we
16		probably would have changed the approach to that, and
17		how we actually covered this.
18	Q.	Would Mr Casey be have been able to take on the role of
19		PIM-aware investigator?
20	Α.	Very much so, yes.
21	Q.	Then it goes on to say:
22		"Minimum deployment of PIRC personnel."
23		And it is split into the scene and the PIM suite.
24		We see at the scene it lists a senior investigating
25		officer, a scribe, a scene manager and two production

1 officers. So that is five roles there listed. And then 2 PIM suite: PIM-aware investigator, scribe, scene manager 3 and production officer. Four there. 4 Is that something that -- in an investigation where 5 there is a scene and a PIM suite, would you normally 6 expect to deploy these or have these roles filled by 7 PIRC? 8 Α. Yes. 9 So five at the scene and -- involved with the scene and Q. 10 four as part of the PIM suite? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. Thank you. I would like to ask you some questions about 13 another matter, again this is prior to May 2015, and 14 an incident on 18 October 2014. So this is where PIRC 15 were involved in investigating an incident at Victoria Hospital where CS spray was discharged and then 16 17 a report was prepared by PIRC with certain recommendations after that incident. I think you were 18 aware of this incident, weren't you? 19 20 I was aware of it, yes. I didn't -- from recollection Α. 21 I don't think I had any direct involvement in it, but 22 yes, I was aware of it. Q. There had been an incident in Victoria Hospital 23 24 regarding the discharge of CS spray, there was a PIRC 25 report and do you remember any of the recommendations

1		that were made or involved in that incident?
2	A.	I'm afraid not, no, sorry.
3	Q.	Can you help us understand at that time we may hear
4		evidence that there were recommendations made to
5		Police Scotland, I am interested in what powers, if any,
6		PIRC had to enforce recommendations that were made to
7		police or to follow up on those recommendations to
8		ensure that they had been carried out?
9	Α.	A report, a Police Scotland referred report is completed
10		and goes through the management process, the
11		recommendations and findings are reported back to either
12		Police Scotland or any other agency. We retain a record
13		of the recommendations and we monitor the responses to
14		these and we give them a set period of time to respond.
15		If we don't get a response then we follow that up, and
16		I would say I am not aware of any occasions where
17		something hasn't been implemented in relation to the
18		recommendations, but that my knowledge on this
19		specific one, as I say, is very limited.
20	Q.	We may hear evidence about this later, the response was
21		later than perhaps was expected. Can I turn to
22		something else now and ask you about your experience
23		prior 3 May 2015.
24	A.	Yes.
25	Q.	I think you said in your Inquiry statements in the

1		first Inquiry statement, you say:
2		"Prior to 3 May 2015 [you] did not have experience
3		
		of dealing with a death in police custody."
4		That is paragraph 33, but in your second statement
5		at paragraph 14, you say:
6		"PIRC had dealt with 30 deaths in custody and [you]
7		had led personally three of those deaths."
8		There seems to be
9	A.	Yes
10	Q.	a disparity there and I wondered if you could help us
11		understand what the right answer is?
12	A.	Certainly. The latter is the right answer because
13		I looked at that very closely, and checked the ones
14		I had been involved in.
15	Q.	So prior
16	A.	So I can't answer why I just
17	Q.	It may be
18	Α.	it must be an oversight.
19	Q.	Yes. Prior to 3 May 2015, how many deaths in custody
20		investigations had you been involved in for PIRC?
21	Α.	Prior to what date sorry?
22	Q.	3 May 2015. As a PIRC investigator, how many deaths in
23		custody had you been involved with?
24	A.	Not leading, just involved in?
25	Q.	Let's start with involved with, for PIRC, as a PIRC

1 investigator?

2	A.	I'm afraid that would be very difficult to put a number
3		on. I have no recollection of that. The second
4		statement that you referred me to is as accurate as
5		regarding involvement in the investigation into deaths.
6	Q.	Can we take from that that from PIRC coming into
7		existence on 1 April 2013 up to 3 May 2015, that you had
8		been involved in three leading personally three
9		deaths in custody?
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	Can you tell us a little about those deaths in custody
12		investigations?
13	A.	I am sorry, without refreshing my memory specifically
14		with them
15	Q.	Did any of them involve the deaths of a black man in
16		custody?
17	A.	No, they did not.
18	Q.	Were they white men, white women?
19	A.	I am not sure if they are male or female but I am sure
20		they were white.
21	Q.	All three of them?
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	When we say "in custody", do you remember anything about
24		the circumstances of the deaths? We have heard there
25		can be different types of death in custody?

1	A.	Yes, you could have a kind of formal death in custody,
2		a lot of people would take it was possibly in a cell,
3		within a police station. However, deaths in custody
4		also include during the course of arrest, anywhere would
5		be would still be a death in custody as well, which
6		would be an automatic referral by Crown to us to
7		investigate as well.
8	Q.	We have heard that a death in custody could involve
9		someone dying from an overdose of drugs in a cell
10		while they are in a cell?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	No involvement of police officers in that matter, they
13		have been found to have passed away?
14	Α.	Yes, because they were formally in custody at that time.
15	Q.	We have also heard deaths in custody could be during the
16		course of an arrest?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	Of the three that you had led personally, do you
19		remember what category they fell into?
20	Α.	I'm afraid not, no. I don't remember.
21	Q.	You don't remember if any of them were during the course
22		of arrest by officers?
23	Α.	No.
24	Q.	Can I ask you about your training. You say in your
25		second statement at paragraph 5:

1		"There was no PIRC training on carrying out
2		investigations or more specifically into a death in
3		police custody."
4		We have got other evidence available to us about the
5		training that was provided by PIRC. I am thinking about
6		the period up to May 2015 prior to the incident. Do you
7		remember having any training about deaths in custody or
8		carrying out investigations of that sort?
9	Α.	No.
10	Q.	So were you reliant on your experience or training that
11		you had had as a police officer?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	Was there any training, during that period you were
14		working for PIRC on investigations, involving issues
15		where race or racial discrimination was a factor to be
16		considered?
17	Α.	No.
18	Q.	Again, were you reliant on your experience or training
19		as a police officer for that?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	Had you had any specific training as a police officer on
22		investigating deaths where race or racial discrimination
23		was a factor?
24	Α.	Sorry, could you say the question again?
25	Q.	In your experience as a police officer had you had any

1		specific training, when you were an officer, about
2		carrying out investigations where race or racial
3		discrimination was a factor?
4	A.	No, I don't recall at all. I think that is unlikely,
5		I don't think so.
6	Q.	Did you have experience of conducting an investigation
7		of that sort when you were a police officer?
8	A.	No, no.
9	Q.	Had you had any specific Article 2 training? We have
10		looked at documents and the five principles, had you had
11		any specific training when you were in PIRC that related
12		to that, an investigation that was compliant with
13		Article 2?
14	A.	I don't think so.
15	Q.	Had you received any training in relation to the
16		three documents we have looked at, had you had any
17		training about those or?
18	A.	I don't have any recollection whether, when the
19		documents were created, that we then had team
20		discussions in relation to that. That is a possibility
21		but as I say I don't recall that far back whether that
22		actually occurred or not. I would say that would be
23		a natural progression.
24	Q.	But nothing you remember?
25	Α.	Not anything I specifically recall, no.

1 Q. You said that you were PIP-aware, post-incident 2 procedure aware? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. Can you explain, had you had any training when you were 5 in PIRC about post-incident procedures? 6 I think we had had input. Whether that would classify Α. 7 as formal training~... There was a formal training course for post-incident process which some of our staff 8 9 had gone to with Police Scotland. I hadn't done that, 10 I haven't done that. But I am sure there was inputs on the processes and the individual roles that people may 11 12 undertake as part of that process. 13 So something that you were aware of? Q. 14 Α. Yes. 15 If I was -- but if I was to ask you specific questions Q. 16 about the standard operating procedure that relates when 17 they are dealing with post-incident procedures, is that 18 something you had had any training on? 19 I am not sure -- I wouldn't be able to answer that, Α. 20 I can't remember, no. 21 Q. I think you had had some PIM awareness training, maybe 22 before May 2015, PIM awareness? Yes, it was just going back to what I was talking about 23 Α. 24 where I think potentially people that were formally trained within the organisation had then cascaded out 25

1	that awareness to everybody because they potentially
2	at all levels they could have a position where they
3	would have to play a part in that, so that awareness
4	training I think was done for staff.
5	Q. Do you remember how long that training took?
6	A. No, I don't.
7	Q. Was it a lengthy training course with materials and sort
8	of presentations, or was it something less formal than
9	that?
10	A. I couldn't say exactly, I'm afraid. I am not sure.
11	Q. Were all investigators made aware through this training
12	or was it just selective
13	A. No, I believe so, I think it was cascaded to everybody,
14	I think.
15	MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I am about to move on, if that
16	might be an appropriate time.
17	LORD BRACADALE: Very well. We will take a 20-minute break.
18	(11.30 am)
19	(A short break)
20	(11.56 am)
21	LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
22	MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I would like to move on to the
23	initial instruction that you got. You had a call with
24	David Green from the Crown Office; is that correct?
25	A. That's right.

1	Q.	It may assist if you have in front of you your
2		operational notes. I think there will be a hard copy,
3		they are in your own handwriting. This is PIRC 01468.
4		I think it is page 2 but I think we have a covering
5		sheet on the thank you. That is the page I am
6		looking for, it's page 3. You will see the handwriting
7		in the right-hand column, "Sunday 3 May 2015".
8		Your first Inquiry statement which is typed up has
9		at paragraph 8 has a record of the detail of your
10		telephone conversation with David Green and that was at
11		9.35 on the morning of the Sunday?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	Could I ask, those handwritten notes that we see on the
14		screen, when did you prepare or write up those notes?
15	Α.	It would either be during the conversation or just at
16		the conclusion of it. Depending on the circumstances it
17		is a bit of both, whether it was right at the time or
18		immediately after, but it was contemporaneous.
19	Q.	On Sunday 3 May you were on call that day?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	Were you in Hamilton at your desk, or were you at home
22		when you received this call?
23	Α.	No, I was at home.
24	Q.	When you are on call as PIRC investigator there is
25		information in some of the statements that you do it on

1		a rota basis?
2	A.	Yes, that is right.
3	Q.	Can you stay at home and wait and be ready if you
4		receive a call but you may not receive a call?
5	A.	It would be the latter the vast majority of time.
6		Unless it was your normal working day then you would be
7		at home or elsewhere, doing as close to normal as
8		possible.
9	Q.	So you are on call on Sunday 3 May, you are available,
10		you have your phone beside you, but not necessarily
11		sitting in the office?
12	A.	No, more often than not, not sitting in the office.
13	Q.	So these would have been these handwritten notes
14		would have been prepared at the time or shortly after
15		the call with David Green?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	What I will do is I will read out what is in the
18		statement to the Inquiry and would you mind looking
19		at your handwriting and make sure that I am not making
20		any mistakes.
21	A.	Sure.
22	Q.	If I say anything wrong when I read your writing, please
23		just stop me and let me know.
24	A.	Okay.
25	Q.	Thank you:

"Calling re ..." 1 2 So this was 9.35 hours, call from David Green, we see that at the top. We will hear that David Green is 3 4 from Crown Office: 5 "Calling re a death in police custody in the Kirkcaldy area. He has received report from 6 7 Police Scotland that they attended an incident at 07.00 this morning, somewhere in Kirkcaldy town centre." 8 9 Is that all correct so far? 10 Α. Yes. "Report was of a black male with a knife above his head 11 Q. 12 causing a serious disturbance ... " Is that correct? 13 14 Yes. Α. 15 Q. "... (full location ..." 16 This is in brackets: 17 "... (full location unknown at present). "Male and female uniformed officers attend locus, 18 19 challenge male, fight takes place during which CS and 20 baton used." 21 Α. Yes. 22 "Eventually placed in police vehicle and he subsequently Q. collapses. Paramedics attend the scene and do CPR." 23 24 Is that correct? 25 A. Yes.

Q. "Taken to Kirkcaldy Royal Infirmary and dies at
 09.04 hours."

3 A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. In your second statement, and we could maybe
put this up on the screen, SBPI 00382. I am interested
in paragraph 44, please. At this stage you are talking
about a later call which I will come back to and your
responses, if we can look at that, further down:

9 "Prior to my second telephone call with Mr Green, my 10 understanding from him was that the PIRC were to 11 investigate the police involvement and physical 12 interaction with Mr Bayoh leading to his death, which 13 would include the actions of the deceased and police 14 officers in Hayfield Road, Kirkcaldy."

So this -- is it correct to say that was your understanding --

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. -- prior to the second call?

A. The second call, yes, which had some more detail within
 it.

Q. You also say in an earlier statement, one of the PIRC statements we looked at, at the beginning -- I don't need you to put this on the screen -- that no formal instructions came from Crown that day, they were intended to follow in due course?

1	Α.	Yes, and that would be normal. Very rarely, if at all,
2		we would get a written instruction on the same day.
3	Q.	On the day.
4	A.	Particularly given it was a weekend as well.
5	Q.	So in terms of your understanding at that point, having
6		had your conversation with David Green in the morning,
7		and knowing that PIRC were to be instructed, what was
8		your understanding of the scope of the investigation
9		PIRC were to carry out?
10	Α.	It was to investigate the interaction with the police
11		leading up to his death and the subsequent the
12		activity at Kirkcaldy hospital.
13	Q.	We have heard evidence that your role at that time was
14		restricted to the events in Hayfield Road?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	And then in Victoria Hospital
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	where he had been taken?
19	A.	And that was subject of the other part of the extended
20		conversation with Mr Green, later, was clarifying that
21		was basically Hayfield Road and the hospital.
22	Q.	So at the beginning when the conversation is taking
23		place, what was your understanding of what
24		Police Scotland would investigate?
25	Α.	I got more clarity on that during the second

1		conversation with Mr Green, which wasn't too long after
2		that, that they would continue with any investigative
3		work in relation to the other scenes and the activity
4		some time prior to Mr Bayoh's interaction with the
5		police officers.
6	Q.	So was there effectively a split at that point?
7	Α.	At that point, yes.
8	Q.	The police would continue to have the authority to
9		investigate events prior to Hayfield Road but PIRC would
10		have the authority and the responsibility to deal with
11		events at Hayfield Road and in the hospital?
12	Α.	Yes, obviously that changed, I think it was on the 4th
13		I think.
14	Q.	But at that initial
15	A.	That initial stage, that is what it was.
16	Q.	stage, there was effectively two investigations to be
17		run: one the responsibility of the police, one the
18		responsibility of PIRC?
19	A.	I would describe them as parallel.
20	Q.	Parallel investigations.
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	You also say in your second statement at paragraph 19:
23		"I do not recall being aware of the legislative
24		basis upon which PIRC were instructed to investigate."
25		Earlier this morning you talked, and you explained

1		the distinction between (b)(i) and (b)(ii), (b)(i) being
2		the criminal investigation and (b)(ii) being the
3		circumstances?
4	A.	Yes, it is maybe the wording, I mean, to me it was
5		a (b)(ii), there was no any other outcomes from that.
6	Q.	You said you weren't aware about the legislative basis.
7		Now, when I asked you questions about that this morning,
8		you said you would take a different PIRC would take
9		a different approach depending on which (b)(i) or
10		(b)(ii) it was. What impact did that have on your
11		actions at that point, at that early stage?
12	A.	To be honest I would take it as read it was a (b)(ii)
13		because it had come from Mr Green who was the head of
14		the Scottish Fatalities Unit. So I went on that basis.
15		I didn't have any doubt that that was how it was being
16		referred.
17	Q.	So you proceeded from that very first call on the basis
18		it was a (b)(ii)?
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	And it wasn't criminal investigation?
21	A.	Yes. Definitely.
22	Q.	Did that make a difference to your approach generally in
23		relation to the investigation, or to how you proceeded
24		at that point?
25	A.	Yes.

1 Q. What difference did that make?

Obviously I had to consider, once I was properly 2 Α. 3 briefed, or as far as I could be, on what the situation 4 was at that time, what had occurred, then to set my kind 5 of strategy and priorities of what we were going to do, how we were going to approach it, what staff we would 6 7 need potentially, what we were going to require Police Scotland to do moving forward and that obviously 8 9 developed as the day went on. And clarification of the 10 status of the police officers.

Q. You talked earlier about if it was a (b)(i), a criminal investigation, there would be changes to the status of the officers involved. Would there be more stringent requirements if it was a criminal investigation under (b)(i)?

Yes, we would have to be aware of the fact there was 16 Α. 17 a number of officers involved, what evidence we had at 18 the time, which would suggest any sort of criminal 19 allegation and specific -- the identification of 20 officers would be paramount in that on any subsequent 21 interaction any of the staff could have, or any of the 22 Police Scotland staff as well, in relation to what they could be asked to do, yes. 23

Q. Would it have made a difference to your approach toconferral, avoiding conferral between the officers, if

1		it had been a (b)(i) rather than the (b)(ii)?
2	Α.	It would be pretty much the same because you would
3		expect that there is no conferring in relation to the
4		incident.
5	Q.	So your expectation would be that the police wouldn't
6		would be told not to confer?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	And wouldn't confer?
9	Α.	I would expect that from the offset, from prior to us
10		being involved and actually getting there.
11	Q.	Whose responsibility would it be to ensure that
12		the police are not conferring?
13	Α.	One of the senior police officers at Kirkcaldy, or that
14		had been brought to the incident.
15	Q.	Did you consider that you had any responsibility to
16		ensure that there was no conferral, as the lead
17		investigator?
18	Α.	Not at that time, no. As I say, if the circumstances
19		had been different and we referred back to the
20		documentation that you showed me earlier, then that is
21		quite clear that that is part of the post-incident
22		process, but not at that time.
23	Q.	You have told us you weren't aware that there was
24		a post-incident procedure
25	Α.	That is correct.

1	Q.	in place at that time. But had there been, you think
2		the procedures would have been different?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	We have heard from Conrad Trickett that if there is
5		a post-incident procedure in place, that officers who
6		are suspects are removed from that process?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	Is that your understanding?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	Did you consider this split, this parallel
11		investigation, to be helpful or a hindrance to the PIRC
12		investigation?
13	Α.	I wouldn't say it was I didn't view it as a hindrance
14		at that time but obviously there was a re-evaluation of
15		the circumstances and the fact that the wider part of
16		the incident was much clearer, that that was a build-up
17		to the subsequent events in Hayfield Road, so once that
18		was clearer, there was the decision made that that was
19		all incorporated into one investigation.
20		But to be fair, on the day, I don't think it
21		hindered me but there was still significant
22		communication between myself and the SIO on a regular
23		basis, and other police staff, in relation to whatever
24		developments were occurring in relation to the other
25		scenes and associated events.

1	Q.	We may hear later that it was on 5 May that the first
2		letter of instruction
3	Α.	Yes, I am aware of that.
4	Q.	came in from the Crown, and from then on the
5		investigations were combined?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	At the time, on 3 May when there was the split, the
8		parallel investigations, how was that distinction and
9		that split communicated to the police, the officers with
10		Police Scotland any officers with Police Scotland?
11	A.	It was communicated to the SIO, it was also made
12		reference to in detail at the Gold Group meetings as
13		well. Possibly both meetings at that time.
14	Q.	Who communicated that to the SIO?
15	Α.	Me.
16	Q.	You. We have heard the SIO was Pat Campbell.
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	When did you communicate that to him?
19	Α.	It would be after the conversation with Mr Green at some
20		point. I don't know if there is reference in my own
21		notes to that, but
22	Q.	Please feel free to look at them if they help you. We
23		have talked about the 9.35 discussion with David Green,
24		and in your statement you also talk about the 12.30
25		conversation, a second call with David Green.

1		(Pause).
2	Α.	Yes, certainly the 12.30 conversation with Mr Green, he
3		confirmed the position as regards what we dealt with in
4		the two scenes.
5	Q.	So, between the 9.35 call and the 12.30 call with
6		David Green, were you clear during that period that
7		there were to be parallel investigations?
8	Α.	Sorry, what was the first time?
9	Q.	9.35, that is on page 3 of your operational notes. That
10		is the
11	Α.	9.35 was obviously the initial call with Mr Green. No,
12		that wasn't confirmed until the second conversation that
13		I had with him, we had an extended conversation and
14		I was then directed to deal with it in that manner.
15	Q.	So in the period between 9.35 when PIRC have been
16		officially appointed and 12.30, it wasn't clear to you
17		that there was to be parallel investigations?
18	Α.	No, initially it was to investigate the interaction with
19		the police leading up to the death. Then, obviously
20		from the conversations I had with the PSD representative
21		and subsequently Pat Campbell, we obviously got more
22		information on that was known for the investigation
23		at that time which was summarised to Mr Green in the
24		next conversation and then that is when that decision
25		was made.

1	Q.	Up until 12.30, you thought you were taking the lead on
2		everything; is that fair to say?
3	A.	No, I wouldn't say I thought that the interaction my
4		knowledge at that time was that was in Hayfield Road,
5		and that is you know, there had been prior
6		involvement and activity that led up to the incident,
7		and that is part I had to acquire all that additional
8		information to get a wider picture and that was part of
9		the reason that I subsequently discussed that with
10		Mr Green, when I was more aware of what had happened.
11	Q.	Prior to your 12.30 conversation with David Green, did
12		you appreciate in any way that there had been a lead-up
13		to the event at Hayfield Road?
14	A.	Yes, I am sure I had some awareness of what was going
15		on, that there was some there had been events prior
16		to that which had involved Mr Bayoh and others.
17	Q.	Prior to 12.30, who did you believe was investigating
18		those prior events?
19	A.	Still Police Scotland.
20	Q.	So you did know that there was to be a parallel
21		investigation by Police Scotland after 9.35?
22	A.	Yes, these events were already ongoing as regarding
23		activities and trying to acquire further information,
24		the wider scope of the previous incidents, and obviously
25		I was made aware of that.

1	Q.	Did the 12.30 conversation simply reinforce what you
2		already believed was the position?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	In your understanding how was the information about
5		the parallel investigation communicated to the police?
6	Α.	As I say, it was either prior to or during the first
7		Gold Group meeting that I attended that articulated the
8		discussion, and the more definitive direction that I had
9		received from Mr Green.
10	Q.	If we have heard some of the officers give evidence and
11		say they thought PIRC were coming in to deal with
12		everything, would that surprise you? This is in the
13		morning.
14	A.	Yes, it depends at what time in the morning.
15	Q.	So what time in the morning do you think they should
16		have stopped believing that?
17	A.	When I gave them a definitive update on the direction
18		that we had had from Crown.
19	Q.	You have mentioned the Gold Group meeting, the first one
20		you attended. We may hear that was at 2.40 in the
21		afternoon.
22	A.	Yes.
23	Q.	So would that be the point at which you gave that
24		definitive information to Police Scotland?
25	A.	That would be the latest point. As I say, that may have

1		taken part of the conversation that I had with
2		Pat Campbell and others prior to that taking place.
3	Q.	When was that conversation with Pat Campbell?
4	Α.	Just immediately before that Gold Group meeting.
5	Q.	We will come on to this but we may hear that there had
6		been a handover or a briefing in the period immediately
7		prior to the second Gold Group meeting, which was
8		attended by Pat Campbell?
9	Α.	Yes, I think you referred to that as the formal handover
10		earlier.
11	Q.	Yes.
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	So it was at that formal handover that you explained the
14		split, the parallel investigations, to Police Scotland,
15		was it?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	What were your expectations in terms of expecting the
18		police to be aware that there was to be this parallel
19		investigation or split prior to that meeting you had
20		with Pat Campbell, the handover? Who did you expect to
21		be explaining to Police Scotland that PIRC weren't doing
22		everything, there was going to be a parallel
23		investigation?
24	Α.	That would be initially through Pat Campbell, to be
25		cascaded out.

1	Q.	So if you only told him at say prior to the 2.40
2		Gold Group meeting what the position was, who would you
3		have expected to tell Pat Campbell about the parallel
4		investigation?
5	Α.	I would have done.
6	Q.	Right. You have explained that you told him during the
7		handover. What was happening between the period from
8		7.30 in the morning to the handover prior to the
9		Gold Group meeting?
10	A.	I don't know if there was reference because obviously
11		after I spoke to Dave Green or have I spoken to him
12		again?
13	Q.	You spoke to him again at 12.30. Will we look at your
14		notes on the 12.30 call, I think it's page 5 at the
15		bottom, "Call to Dave Green". Do you want to read those
16		out?
17	A.	"Call to Dave Green."
18		That is at 12.30:
19		"Provided situational update. He wants to see press
20		release, prefers early PM. Confirms PIRC deal with
21		incident scene and hospital."
22		And then there is a follow-up call ten minutes later
23		to Pat Campbell. I asked him to confirm regarding
24		footwear, status of officers as witnesses,
25		Stuart Houston scene co-ordinator~

1	Q.	So there is these two calls, one at 12.30, one at 12.40,
2		one after the other. One is with Dave Green, he
3		confirms that PIRC are to deal with the incident scene
4		and the hospital.
5	A.	I think logically I would have said to Pat Campbell at
6		that time, during that conversation, although it is not
7		noted there on the day you are not going to note
8		everything but you know that is obviously
9		significant, and then it would be further discussed and
10		it was certainly then raised at the Gold Group meeting
11		later on.
12	Q.	So you would have had a conversation with Pat Campbell
13		which is noted there at 12.40
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	where you confirmed, having received confirmation
16		from Dave Green, confirmed that PIRC are dealing with
17		the incident scene and the hospital
18	A.	Yes
19	Q.	only?
20	A.	I would as I say, I don't specifically remember
21		the exact conversation and I haven't noted that that
22		formally took place, but to my mind that would be
23		an obvious thing, particularly after that very recent
24		conversation with David Green.
25	Q.	I think a short moment ago you had said that that

1 conversation with Dave Green was simply confirming your 2 understanding --3 Α. Yes. 4 -- of the scope of your investigation? Q. 5 Yes, and by that time I had received, obviously, updates Α. from PSD and from Pat Campbell in relation to the wider 6 7 knowledge of the circumstances and what had been done to date, which -- I don't know the extent of Mr Green's 8 9 initial briefing that he got, and obviously there is 10 information within that that transpired is not correct anyway, so it's -- I would think it would be very 11 12 limited in the circumstances that he would get. 13 So you've confirmed that to Pat Campbell when you spoke Q. 14 to him. But prior to that call with Pat Campbell at 15 12.40, had you had a specific conversation with Pat Campbell about the parallel investigation? 16 I don't think so, not at that stage. 17 Α. 18 Q. So you certainly hadn't shared that with Pat Campbell at 19 that time? No, I don't think so, prior to that, no. 20 Α. 21 Q. Let's look at the information you were initially given 22 in your role. Can we look at your first Inquiry statement, which is SBPI00259. I am interested in 23 paragraphs 7 and 8. This is where you talk about some 24 initial information that was given to you by 25

1 David Green, the person from Crown Office. And you are referring back to one of your earlier statements. You 2 3 say: "Mr Green confirmed a number of police officers 4 attended this incident and on their arrival 5 an altercation took place between this, as yet 6 7 unidentified male, and the officers." Do you remember this? 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. "During this altercation he told me that CS spray had been discharged and the officers had used their batons. 11 12 He added, that during a subsequent struggle the male 13 collapsed and an ambulance was summoned. He was 14 subsequently taken to hospital where life was pronounced 15 extinct at 09.04 hours. "I am asked whether the order of events suggested to 16 17 me that Mr Bayoh had instigated the altercation. Yes. The inference was that the male's actions had resulted 18 in the police attendance and then subsequently having to 19 20 take some sort of action on the circumstances that they 21 met and that was my summation of what he was telling me." 22 So you have explained your understanding of the 23 24 chronology of events as was shared with you by David Green? 25

1 A. Yes.

2	Q.	When you are talking about these notes, and you are
3		talking in paragraph 8 about your operational notes,
4		were these notes here and the operational notes again
5		made roughly about the time of the call or shortly
6		after, or was this at a different time?
7	Α.	Probably shortly after, I would think.
8	Q.	So let's look at paragraph 8. You say:
9		"I have been asked about my Operational Notes~
10		which record the detail of my telephone conversation
11		with David Green at 0935."
12		We have looked at this already:
13		"Calling re a death in police custody in the
14		Kirkcaldy area. He has received a report from
15		Police Scotland that they attended an incident at 0700
16		this morning somewhere in Kirkcaldy town centre. The
17		report was of a black male with a knife above his head
18		causing a serious disturbance. Full location unknown at
19		present. Male and female uniformed officers attend
20		locus, challenge male, fight takes place during which CS
21		and baton used. Eventually placed in police vehicle and
22		he subsequently collapses. Paramedics attend the scene
23		and do CPR."
24		So again, from this information that you have noted

24 So again, from this information that you have noted
 25 here in your notes am I correct in saying that

1		the information you were being given by David Green
2		suggested that the subject was the aggressor and
3		officers have reacted in self-defence by using sprays
4		or
5	Α.	That was
6	Q.	batons?
7	Α.	the general picture that was created by what I was
8		told.
9	Q.	Thank you. Now, we have heard that the main witnesses,
10		key witness, to the event in Hayfield Road were the
11		officers, they hadn't given statements, initial
12		accounts, basic facts at this stage?
13	Α.	No.
14	Q.	So this was the information you were being given about
15		the circumstances, primary information you were
16		receiving from the Crown?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	Can we look at again, it's in your operational notes,
19		paragraph 9 in your statement. We will keep that on the
20		screen but you are very welcome to look at your notes.
21		Then you talk about your operational notes:
22		" the details of a telephone call with
23		Superintendent Craig Blackhall, from the Police Scotland
24		Professional Standards Department at 1001 hours. He
25		provides [you] with a short summary of the circumstances

and I have noted ..." 1 2 This is your -- what you have written down in your 3 operational notes: "About 0700 hours, a number of calls to 4 5 Police Scotland regarding African male armed with a knife in town centre of Kirkcaldy. Suspect makes run 6 7 at female police officer and assaults her. Suspect is CS'ed, but this has little effect and he laughs. 8 9 Suspect struck with baton at least once. A number of 10 police officers attend the locus. Suspect was unconscious on the ground. CPR done by police and then 11 12 by paramedic short time later." 13 So this is the second source of information you had 14 and this comes from Superintendent Blackhall at PSD? 15 Α. Yes. Again, were those notes made roughly about the time? 16 Q. 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. Again, from what you have written here -- we can see on 19 the screen -- again, does it suggest that a man who is 20 armed with a knife: 21 "... makes a run at a female officer and assaults her." 22 So the subject is the aggressor? 23 It is painting that -- a similar sort of picture but 24 Α. 25 some of the detail was slightly different.

1	Q.	Slightly different detail, but again: subject aggressor,
2		police act in self-defence. Is that a fair reflection
3		of what the information is that you received from
4	Α.	Basically the police were responding to a set of
5		circumstances where and they described the build-up
6		to it and someone being in possession of a knife.
7	Q.	And those police officers had to use their CS spray and
8		their baton at least once?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	In response to the actions taken by the subject?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	You also note that a number of police officers attend
13		the locus, that seems to be after the incident with the
14		aggression and the CS spray and the baton, was that
15		the order that was given to you?
16	Α.	Yes. Obviously I don't know where Craig Blackhall's
17		information is originating from, and whether he was the
18		one that gave the initial account to David Green or not,
19		that kind of series of events surrounding that.
20	Q.	But in terms of the information being supplied to you,
21		you have had the information from David Green initially,
22		and then you are now getting a separate call and this is
23		with Superintendent Blackhall?
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	So this is the second person you have spoken to and the

1 information that they are giving you? 2 Α. Yes. Having been told this a second time, that the subject 3 Q. 4 was the aggressor and the police are having to resort to 5 using spray and batons, did that start to create an impression in your mind of the situation that you 6 7 were dealing with and investigating? Only part of it but it was all there to be subject to 8 Α. 9 clarification as we developed on the day. I couldn't take it in isolation. 10 I would like to move on and ask you about another call 11 Q. 12 you received. This was a call at 10.22 hours and this 13 was with Pat Campbell, the SIO. You will see that some 14 of this is noted in your operational notes. If we look 15 at paragraph 12 of your statement, I will go through this, you have noted down -- in italics there are things 16 17 you have noted in your operational notes. So 18 paragraph 12: "I have been asked about the summary of the 19 20 circumstances in my operational notes and where this 21 material came from. My notes state '07.15 Reporter

22 states male with knife, Hayfield Road. 3 marked police 23 vehicles and 1 unmarked car responded. Male appears in 24 front of them. He runs towards them with knife. Batons 25 pulled out and CS deployed'. From recollection, I think

1		that came directly from Detective Superintendent
2		Pat Campbell."
3		You have noted this in your operational notes.
4	A.	Yes, it was basically a timeline of what he provided in
5		relation to the kind of background as far as he was
6		aware of it.
7	Q.	So this is the third person you have spoken to about
8		the circumstances?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	Again, does it appear from what you have noted there
11		I should say again were these notes roughly
12		contemporaneous or shortly after the call?
13	A.	I think these particularly the timeline that I noted
14		there would be during the call, just basically as he was
15		giving me it, with the detail that is in there, and the
16		specific times as well. So I don't know what he was
17		referring to at the time.
18	Q.	So this isn't from your recollection
19	A.	No, that was
20	Q.	this is the information that Pat Campbell
21	A.	Directly from him, yes.
22	Q.	It appears to be that on this third occasion when you
23		speak to Pat Campbell the information given to you is
24		the male appears in front of officers, he runs towards
25		them with a knife, and then the police pull out batons

1		and CS is deployed?
2	Α.	Yes, and there is more of there's reference to other
3		witness accounts in the build up to that as well which
4		were not there in as much detail in the previous
5		accounts.
6	Q.	So we are looking at three conversations that you have
7		had with different people, Green, Blackhall and
8		Campbell?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And within that period, less than an hour effectively in
11		terms of the times of the call, it appears that you are
12		being given information about the circumstances where
13		the version being given is that the subject was the
14		aggressor, and the officers had to react to that
15		aggression by using baton and spray. Is that a fair
16		summary?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	This is all prior to the officers actually giving any
19		sort of account to PIRC?
20	Α.	Oh, yes, a long time before that.
21	Q.	Looking back now at those three versions having been
22		given to you at the outset in a very short period of
23		time, do you think that influenced your perception of
24		how the event took place and how events carried out?
25	Α.	No, I think it just added to the picture. Still in

1 these circumstances, particularly where there is so many different strands involved, there is a lot of witnesses, 2 3 there are slightly different varying accounts but that 4 is all down to who is reporting into these individuals. 5 So that is part of it, to keep an open mind as things developed. You don't take it as cast in stone that that 6 7 is exactly what happened. And that transpired to be the 8 case, obviously.

Q. What does seem to be consistent from these three 9 10 versions is that the subject was the aggressor, and the police response -- they had to respond in self-defence 11 12 by using sprays and batons. Did that consistency --13 I think that is more reporting that these forms of force Α. 14 were used by the officers, whether it is as strong as 15 suggesting that that was what they had to do because of the circumstances, I think is maybe two different 16 things. It is more just a -- supposed to be a factual 17 18 account, timeline of the build up and then what happened 19 when the officers arrived. I don't think he is saying 20 that that was wholly justified or anything in that 21 regard, it was just that that was part of what happened. 22 So there is no narrative here about all the actions of Q. the officers were justified because they were acting in 23 self-defence? 24

25 A. No, no. I don't think so.

Q. But in terms of the chronology of events that is being
 presented to you, there is the aggression by the subject
 and then a response by the police?

A. Yes.

4

5 You've mentioned keeping an open mind. Obviously we Q. have heard you didn't get any accounts -- any statements 6 from the officers until 4 June, which is just over 7 a month later. They were the witnesses at the scene as 8 9 to what happened. There is other evidence available to 10 the Chair that initially at least PIRC didn't know who had turned up first or who did what because they didn't 11 12 have these statements from the officers.

13 A. Yes.

You have talked earlier today about not having had 14 Q. 15 training in relation to investigations into deaths in custody with PIRC or investigations that may have 16 17 involved issues of race or race discrimination, and I am 18 interested in on the one hand you say you are keeping 19 an open mind, on the other there are three versions, 20 potentially consistent versions, being given to you by 21 different people initially suggesting a certain 22 scenario. How did you feel you were equipped to keep an open mind and to consider the possibility that the 23 24 information you were being given was just completely wrong? 25

A. These were second-hand accounts. As I say, I don't know
who provided that information, that information may have
all come from one source and it was delivered in
a slightly different way, or whether Pat Campbell got
more detailed information from a variety of sources in
and around the incident. I didn't specifically ask him
that at that stage.

8 So I would say that I feel we were still able to 9 keep an open mind as things developed and moved forward 10 during the course of the day. You can initially only 11 deal with the information that you have been given, but 12 still be sensible enough to keep that open mind as 13 potentially conflicting or slightly different 14 information comes in at a later stage.

15 Q. Do you have an expectation that the initial information you have been given is reasonably accurate? 16 Oh, yes, but I have been in many circumstances before 17 Α. 18 where it is just human nature, and things not deliberately get changed but it is just their 19 20 recollection of a discussion with somebody -- it's 21 a fast-moving incident, maybe an account has been given 22 by someone who has maybe limited information and they are doing their best to inform you and make you aware of 23 that, but it is not necessarily 100% correct. And 24 25 again, that transpired to be the case with a few things.

- Q. Is it not reasonable for PIRC investigators such as
 yourself to take things at face value and proceed on the
 basis --
 - A. No.

4

5 Q. No, that is not reasonable?

No, not for me. As I say I would always have other 6 Α. 7 considerations or interpretations of things at the time. Unless I was more than 100% happy it was 100% factual, 8 9 that somebody had presented you with a bit of CCTV and 10 that is exactly what happened and that has supported 11 where that has come from. But, as I say, you just have 12 to -- you accept all information that you've got from 13 whatever sources, and continue to evaluate that during 14 the course of the investigation.

Q. We have heard evidence in relation to training regarding
race that some officers had had about something called
unconscious bias. And we have -- I have asked officers
about how they can guard against unconscious bias,
because it is not something that people are necessarily
aware of, because it is unconscious.

Do you feel you were adequately equipped, yourself, from your -- well, you said you hadn't had training with PIRC but maybe from any other training you have received to guard against that --

25 A. I have certainly never -- I have had training on

unconscious bias but that was after this incident.
I have had a variety of other training but I am aware of
what it is and how it can work with people, and a lot of
times because of the nature of what it is, and the kind
of social stereotyping of people, that they may not even
be aware that they are thinking along these lines and
that is the danger.

So I always like to progress and really think about 8 your decisions, and just take that momentary bit of time 9 10 to consider what you are getting and try and alleviate or negate the fact that that may occur. But it is -- by 11 12 the nature of it, it is unconscious and you are --13 potentially you are not aware personally that it is 14 there, but you have to think these things through all 15 the time, and balance everything up that you are hearing, and the decisions that you intend to make. 16 Looking back now to May 2015, do you feel you had been 17 Q. 18 put into the best position to guard against unconscious 19 bias, never having been given training about that type 20 of thing?

A. I think you can -- let's face it, you can always be
better equipped and, you know, with additional training
in certain areas. I feel on a personal basis that
I think these things through and guard against these
outside influences but you are never going to be able to

1 say it is a perfect world and everybody is 100% trained to cover every aspect of every type of investigation 2 3 that you come across. So there is a bit of hindsight 4 science with that. 5 Do you think, now that you have told us you have had Q. training in unconscious bias, do you think now you are 6 7 in a better position to guard against unconscious bias than maybe you were previously? 8 Yes, I would think so. There is definitely a better 9 Α. 10 understanding of what it actually is, how to guard against it, how other individuals when they are 11 12 conveying information to you or versions of events, 13 things they may be going through and how they articulate 14 that to you, so there are a lot of component parts of 15 that. 16 It is possible that people sharing information with you Q. 17 could themselves be under the influence, if I can put it like that, of conscious bias? 18 19 Absolutely, yes. Α. 20 And they could be sharing that with you? Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 In terms of -- you have told us about you trying to keep Q. an open mind in May 2015. What about the wider team; 23 24 how did you help them keep an open mind? 25 Α. Obviously before we went we had a briefing. That was

1		more to articulate our general understanding of the set
2		of circumstances, but at the time that was very limited.
3		Did we go into details about, you know, the potential
4		for unconscious bias? No, I didn't. No. Maybe more so
5		now in the modern era that may be a consideration but
6		I certainly couldn't say that I did that at the time.
7	Q.	Certainly from the first contact you had with
8		David Green you were made aware that it was a black
9		male?
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	Can I move on and ask you some questions about the
12		change in staffing. Because you were there on 3 May,
13		you were lead investigator, but we have heard evidence
14		that that changed; it changed on 4 May, it became
15		Billy Little?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	And it changed on 5 May, it became John McSporran. Are
18		you aware of that?
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	I think we have heard that you were maybe going on
21		holiday at some point, and that is why you left the role
22		of lead investigator, is that correct?
23	A.	That's correct.
24	Q.	When did you leave to go on holiday?
25	A.	Maybe five or six days after that, I think. From the

Monday. It was probably towards that weekend, from
 recollection.

I'm wondering why you weren't kept in that role for 3 Q. those initial days until you went on holiday? 4 5 Because that -- in essence we knew this was going to run Α. for a long time and part of the reason, the seriousness 6 7 of the incident etc, that was obviously why John McSporran as the senior investigator was put in 8 9 charge to work alongside Billy Little. As soon as the 10 senior management knew -- well, they were aware I was going on holiday, then the sensible option was to make 11 12 that change immediately. That makes sense. To leave me 13 for a period of days then change it wouldn't make sense. 14 It was the much better option to do that immediately. 15 And that happens a lot, in the police world as well. It has happened in PIRC on a number of occasions. As long 16 17 as you are in a position to give an appropriate detailed 18 briefing to whoever is going to take that role on, that 19 is one of the -- the kind of by-products of being on 20 call is that you are dedicated to cover a weekend. 21 You're not going to look at it from a point of view of 22 who's going to carry on in two or three days' time, and that I wouldn't be in a position to do that, so you 23 would call somebody else out to cover the incident. The 24 25 on-call is there to deal with the matters in hand for

1 whatever period. 2 You have said in your statement that you were due to go Q. 3 on leave imminently for two weeks, so you didn't retain 4 the lead: "I was not aware on 3 May that I would not be 5 6 responsible for leading the investigation from the 4th onward." 7 So on 3 May did you assume you would be carrying on 8 for a few days? 9 I don't think I made any assumptions. I don't even 10 Α. recall thinking about how leave was going to impact on 11 12 that. We obviously had that discussion very early part of the Monday on 4 May, and the senior management 13 14 decided that the lead investigator would be Billy Little 15 and then subsequently John McSporran. I am quite interested in that approach, because we will 16 Q. 17 hear evidence that John McSporran, a senior investigator -- so you were at that time 18 a deputy senior investigator, is that right? 19 20 Α. Yes. 21 He was a senior investigator. He took over on 5 May, as Q. I think we will hear. I am wondering why there was 22 a change from you to Billy Little on the 4th. Because 23 you weren't on holiday and you could have done the 24 handover with McSporran on the 5th? 25

1 Α. I wasn't fully a party to the discussions regarding that, but when you look at the kind of priority things 2 3 that were to be dealt with and they wanted that to 4 involve whoever was going to be engaged in the 5 investigation moving forward, then -- because I think 6 Billy was away all day on the Monday at various things, 7 including the post mortem, that that may have been why that happened. 8 Would it not have been beneficial to have you continue 9 Q. 10 in your role until the handover to John McSporran? I don't know when the decision and the circumstances 11 Α. 12 surrounding John being appointed as a more senior 13 individual. I'm not a party to that, those discussions and that decision. 14 15 Q. But Billy Little was the same rank as you? 16 Α. Yes, he was. Do you think there would have been benefits, looking 17 Q. 18 back now with the benefit of hindsight, to you maybe 19 staying in your role until the senior investigator, 20 John McSporran, came in to take the lead? 21 Α. It depends. I don't know on the Monday if they'd 22 intended to put a senior investigator in that position or whether that was after they were more au fait with 23 where the investigation was going, what was going to be 24 involved in it. So I don't know that. But, as I say, 25

1		I think, you know, the correct decision was not to leave
2		me for a period of days and then for me to kind of
3		disappear for a couple of week. I don't think that was
4		the best option.
5	Q.	If Billy Little was away on the 4th, as we will probably
6		hear, at the post mortem, who was holding the fort as
7		the lead investigator at that time on the 4th? Do you
8		remember?
9	Α.	He still would be at that time, even although he was out
10		of the office. That wouldn't change the management
11		oversight, and obviously we had other senior managers
12		who were by that time very au fait with what had
13		happened to that point and who would be overseeing
14		things moving forward as well.
15	Q.	Where were you on the 4th?
16	Α.	In the office.
17	Q.	In the office in Hamilton?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	Who was in Kirkcaldy Police Office that day?
20	Α.	PIRC resources-wise?
21	Q.	Yes.
22	Α.	The only one I can recollect I think was Alistair Lewis
23		I think.
24	Q.	We may hear that he is a family liaison officer for
25		PIRC. He's a trained FLO?

1 A. Yes.

2	Q.	Thank you. You will remember that I asked you earlier
3		today about the five principles to be
4		Article 2-compliant and the first of those was about
5		independence. I would like to ask you some questions
6		about independence if I may. You have talked about the
7		importance of that in relation to your understanding of
8		the role of PIRC. I would like to ask you about prior
9		contact that you had with officers who were working on
10		the Sheku Bayoh investigation. You've said in your
11		first Inquiry statement that you knew
12		Detective Superintendent Pat Campbell as he had been
13		a sergeant at CID headquarters in Pitt Street in Glasgow
14		when you worked on the intelligence side with him, and
15		there was a sort of cross-over?
16	Α.	Yes, he wasn't in the intelligence that I was in
17		intelligence at force headquarters. He was more
18		operational CID.
19	Q.	So he was operational CID, you were intelligence. But
20		you had worked with Pat Campbell, had you?
21	Α.	Not really, no. No.
22	Q.	What does that mean?
23	Α.	He I think was a Detective Sergeant in a role supporting
24		the senior management, is my recollection. But I don't
25		ever remember working directly with Pat Campbell at any

1 time.

2	Q.	You've said in your statement there was some sort of
3		cross-over. What did that mean then between your two
4		roles? Was there some sort of work engagement with
5		Pat Campbell? How did you know him?
6	Α.	Not directly with him, with his senior managers. In the
7		role that I did one of the things under my umbrella was
8		in relation to covert activity and authorisations for
9		such activity and there would be some interaction
10		between me and his managers, but that wouldn't, from
11		recollection, have ever involved Pat Campbell either.
12	Q.	So you weren't concerned that would give rise to any
13		conflict?
14	A.	Not at all. No. Definitely not.
15	Q.	So you have said you knew him, you spoke to him on
16		occasions but no
17	A.	That was it.
18	Q.	No connection as such?
19	A.	No.
20	Q.	Did you feel it necessary to declare that knowledge of
21		Pat Campbell as part of your investigation?
22	Α.	No.
23	Q.	No. Did it give rise to any concerns in your mind of
24		bias or conflict or having an impact on independence?
25	A.	None whatsoever.

1	Q.	Were you concerned in any way about the perception of
2		the public in relation to your you having known
3		Pat Campbell from previous work in Police Scotland?
4	Α.	No. I think if I had worked closely with him or
5		socialised with him, then that's a different thing. But
6		not at the level of contact and knowledge I had.
7	Q.	When you say "worked closely", what does that sort of
8		mean? How would would that be someone that was your
9		manager or a colleague or
10	Α.	Yes, could be a manager or maybe worked on an
11		investigation and invariably you work in pairs, but
12		there's quite an age difference between the two of us as
13		well. So that's one of the other reasons it probably
14		didn't happen.
15	Q.	Is he older than you?
16	Α.	I wish.
17	Q.	And you also knew ACC Nicholson?
18	Α.	Yes, I did.
19	Q.	That again was from your time in Strathclyde Police?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	I think you he was the Gold commander, we heard, on
22		3 May?
23	Α.	He was.
24	Q.	I think you had spoken to him previously?
25	A.	Yes.

1	Q.	Did you consider the impact of your prior connection
2		with ACC Nicholson to be giving rise to possible
3		conflict or bias?
4	A.	No, definitely not.
5	Q.	Can you describe your connection with Nicholson for me,
6		please?
7	Α.	He was a senior manager on the operations side of CID at
8		the time that I had a senior role within the
9		intelligence side of the business. But I had very
10		little contact with him again.
11	Q.	Did you feel it necessary to declare your knowledge in
12		connection with Nicholson?
13	Α.	No.
14	Q.	Did you have any concern about the perception of that
15		contact with Nicholson
16	A.	No.
17	Q.	in relation to the public?
18	A.	No.
19	Q.	I would like to ask you to comment on some evidence we
20		have heard from Collette Bell. She was the partner of
21		Mr Bayoh. She gave evidence on Day 40 of the Inquiry
22		in February of last year and she said she was aware that
23		PIRC were made up of ex-police and she said:
24		"I think I had lost all trust in the police at this
25		point and I didn't really want anything to do with the

1 police or PIRC because I thought they're all made up of 2 ex-police officers and they're supposed to be 3 independent, but how independent can you be if it's all 4 ex-officers that are -- that make up PIRC. It's not 5 really transparent if it's the police investigating the police. I remember just feeling very defensive and 6 7 I thought this just isn't very fair. You're supposed to be transparent." 8

9 That was her evidence to the Inquiry. Do you have 10 any comments to make about that or concerns yourself 11 about this perception that a member of the public has in 12 relation to PIRC?

13 The first comment I would make is factually that Α. 14 obviously I mean it's -- the PIRC is not made up of 100% 15 police officers, which is the inference from what Ms Bell had said there. There is a lot of investigators 16 17 from other investigative backgrounds, and that I would say is quite important. Perception is a very difficult 18 thing to combat and some of the people will get 19 20 definitive views and will not move from that no matter 21 what they see and hear. If you look at a lot of the 22 previous investigations that have gone into the public forum on our website, et cetera and some of the outcomes 23 and findings with these would hopefully -- for any 24 members of the public who read these would show some of 25

1		the strong outcomes from these investigations, that
2		there was no bias and that they are basically just
3		saying what occurred and giving the proper outcomes from
4		these investigations. That is part of probably
5		understanding and trying to combat perceptions which we
6		think are misplaced.
7	Q.	Of the PIRC investigators who were in Kirkcaldy Police
8		Office on 3 May were any of them not police or former
9		police officers?
10	A.	Yes, one.
11	Q.	Who was that?
12	A.	Stuart Taylor.
13	Q.	What was his background?
14	A.	I don't know what he did before he joined the
15		organisation but he came through our trainee programme
16		from his previous employment through that probationary
17		period, trained and became an investigator and he is now
18		deputy senior investigator and has been for a few years.
19	Q.	I think earlier today you said there were six
20		investigators who were in Kirkcaldy that day?
21	Α.	Including myself, yes.
22	Q.	Including you. So seven investigators
23	Α.	No, six including myself.
24	Q.	Sorry, six including yourself.
25	A.	And one at the office.

25

Would that be Casey --1 Q. 2 Α. Yes. 3 -- who was in the office. And that is in Hamilton? Q. 4 Α. Yes. 5 And Taylor was not from a police background? Q. 6 A. No. 7 MS GRAHAME: I am going to stay with this topic but I am going to move on to different issues. 8 9 I wonder if that would be an appropriate time? 10 LORD BRACADALE: We will stop for lunch and sit at 11 2 o'clock. 12 (1.00 pm) 13 (The short adjournment) 14 (2.00 pm) 15 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Before lunch I was asking you some 16 17 questions about independence and conflict, to ask you to 18 comment. 19 As I understand the information we have, there was 20 a code of conduct for employees who worked for PIRC, at 21 least in March 2014, and that give some guidance to members of staff about conflicts and maintaining 22 independence and what would happen if they were faced 23 24 with an ethical dilemma.

I think I touched on this earlier this morning, that

1 the police are a hierarchical organisation with rank, and I asked certain witnesses to give evidence about 2 3 the -- whether individual officers would feel they could 4 speak up if they saw something that they weren't 5 comfortable with, and I want to ask you that in relation to PIRC. Do you think individual investigators would 6 7 feel comfortable speaking up if they saw something they weren't happy with or they felt something wasn't being 8 9 done properly? 10 Α. By Police Scotland senior managers? In relation to PIRC. Let's say first of all a PIRC 11 Q. 12 investigator sees something being done in relation to 13 a PIRC -- another PIRC investigator, or they have missed 14 something or they feel concerned about something; do you 15 think they would be willing to speak up about that? These sort of thing are an individual choice. I think 16 Α. 17 the atmosphere and the way that the organisation 18 operates would encourage that sort of thing. But sometimes for people that is not enough, so I couldn't 19 20 comment on everyone on a personal basis, but certainly 21 for me I would -- if I was giving an opinion on that 22 I would say the organisation was very open and would encourage reporting of anything such because, as we 23 discussed before, the independence aspect and the public 24 25 perception of what we do is highly important, we stand

1		and fall by that. So, as I say, we would always
2		encourage staff to bring any like issues to the
3		attention of senior management.
4	Q.	Would you say that the atmosphere in PIRC is quite
5		encouraging and open to discuss constructively issues
6		that arise?
7	A.	Yes, I would say so, yes.
8	Q.	Let's look briefly at the code of conduct, the Chair can
9		obviously read this at his leisure. It is PIRC 04574.
10		This is dated March 2014, "Code of conduct for
11		employees". Do you recognise this document
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	on the screen? We will very briefly it says at
14		the outset that it's an important document and it:
15		" sets out the standards of behaviour the PIRC
16		expects of its staff. You should read it and if you do
17		not understand how the Code applies to you, you should
18		ask your line manager to go through it with you. In
19		future, it will be part of the induction process so all
20		new staff will have it drawn to their attention when
21		they start work."
22		Was this available to all staff?
23	A.	Yes, we have had an induction process which has sort of
24		grown over the years, and one of the parts of that is
25		for all staff to make themselves aware of the various

1 procedures and processes in the documents that relate to 2 that. Is that something you have been through as well, the 3 Q. 4 induction process, or was it just for new staff? Just for new staff, yes. 5 Α. We will see on the front page as we scan down there is, 6 Q. 7 "Diversity and equal opportunities": "The PIRC attaches high value to diversity and 8 working to eliminate unlawful discrimination." 9 10 Then, "Identifying and declaring a conflict of interest", I asked you before lunch about certain 11 12 situations and whether you had felt that was necessary 13 to declare an interest but it is this code of conduct that sets that out? 14 15 Yes, and that is a certainly something I have been Α. involved in, in the past, where staff have declared 16 potential conflict to err on the side of safety for 17 18 investigations. 19 Then, "Security and confidentiality of information", and Q. 20 that is reinforcing the requirements in terms of data 21 protection, and then, "Concerns about improper conduct", 22 and the code also explains what you should do if you have a concern that illegal or improper activities may 23 be going on in PIRC and how to raise those. If we can 24 25 go on to page 5, please in the centre of this page, this

1		is the introduction, if we look at the centre of the
2		page, there is a section, "Independence", and it says:
3		"We demonstrate our independence by:
4		"Our resolve under pressure.
5		"The people we appoint.
6		"The work we undertake.
7		"Scrupulously avoiding conflicts of interest.
8		"Our organisational culture.
9		"The communications we make."
10		When it says, "The people we appoint", what does
11		that mean?
12	A.	I think that means the people that are taken into
13		employment in the organisation or are appointed to move
14		to a more senior level within internally within the
15		organisation.
16	Q.	When people are appointed, is there a process where they
17		are asked about any you know, independence and the
18		importance of that is explained and they are asked about
19		any conflicts or issues they may have?
20	Α.	When appointed to the organisation initially?
21	Q.	Yes, independence is demonstrated by "the people we
22		appoint", so when those people are appointed, is there
23		a process where that is gone through?
24	A.	A lot of these will be touched upon in the interview
25		processes, because again equality and diversity in

1		particular is a major thing within the organisation and
2		has become even more important over recent years, and
3		invariably that will be included in some aspects through
4		the interview process.
5	Q.	When you were appointed was independence discussed with
6		you?
7	A.	I believe it was.
8	Q.	Do you remember anything about that?
9	A.	Not specifically, I'm afraid, no.
10	Q.	Was the fact you had been in the police for almost
11		30 years raised with you to see whether you could be
12		independent as part of the team at PIRC?
13	A.	I think that was there was some form of questioning,
14		I recall, through the interview process in relation
15		to I am sure there was, in relation to that, and how
16		you could kind of demonstrate that and again so that
17		the, you know, public perception was such that although
18		you may have served a long period in the police that you
19		had the capability to be independent and, you know, to
20		evidence that in some way, in how you articulate that.
21	Q.	Thank you. Can we look at page 7 please. There are
22		a number of bullet points listed:
23		"As an employee you have a responsibility to \ldots "
24		I won't read all of these but we can see as
25		an employee of PIRC you have a responsibility to:

1		" treat complainants, those investigated and
2		other stakeholders with fairness, courtesy and
3		sensitivity to their needs and the situation they are
4		in."
5		There is:
6		"Consider others in the exercise of your duties.
7		"Express your point of view without being aggressive
8		or overbearing.
9		"Learn from your mistakes."
10		Those are just some I have read out.
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	Was it something you were aware of, that those
13		responsibilities were part of the duties of a PIRC
14		employee?
15	A.	Very much so.
16	Q.	Was the importance of those made clear to PIRC
17		employees?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	Now, we've heard evidence that you have talked about
20		getting support from the police as part of your
21		investigation. We have heard evidence that as part of
22		the actions taken by Police Scotland on 3 May that
23		officers were brought in to Kirkcaldy or into the
24		investigation to assist generally, and some of those
25		came from other legacy force Fife Police, so in May 2015

1		it was Police Scotland but prior to the 1 April 2015
2		2013, there had been a number of legacy forces, one of
3		which was Fife Police?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	You are aware of that?
6	A.	Yes, I am aware.
7	Q.	We have heard evidence that some officers were brought
8		in from former legacy Fife Police areas to help with the
9		investigation. Was that of any concern to PIRC, that
10		there were Fife former Fife police officers helping
11		in Kirkcaldy with the investigation?
12	A.	I was aware that other officers were drafted in to
13		support their investigation initially. I don't recall
14		being aware of where they had come from, I don't think
15		at that stage. Certainly latterly, after that, but I am
16		not sure about on the date.
17	Q.	Is it of any concern to you now, if you take it from me
18		that there were officers brought in former
19		Fife Police officers brought in from other areas in Fife
20		to help with the investigation, would that have been any
21		concern to you at the time?
22	A.	Not a huge concern, I think with these things what you
23		would prefer and what is practical in the circumstances
24		is because there were a lot of resources there,
25		including our own, so it wouldn't be a major concern to

1		me at that stage.
2	Q.	So you have said "a huge concern", if they were coming
3		in from Fife areas
4	Α.	No, it wouldn't be a
5	Q.	It wouldn't be a huge concern?
6	A.	No.
7	Q.	Sorry, I misheard you there. Would it have been of any
8		concern to you about issues of conflict, or would you
9		not have considered that matter at all?
10	A.	It would have been difficult to know that. You
11		would the majority of time I would anticipate you
12		would be reliant on the senior managers in the division
13		itself to oversee that probably, I know that at
14		a reasonably every stage they ended up getting
15		additional resources from the Major Investigation Team
16		and part of that was their specialist skills but part of
17		that was that they were not part of the structure in
18		that local area either.
19	Q.	Looking at the situation now, as a PIRC investigator
20		coming in, reliant on Police Scotland resources, would
21		you have a preference about whether it would be officers
22		from a totally different area who supported PIRC?
23	A.	Yes, in an ideal world that would be better and that is
24		dependent on what you were asking them to do or
25		directing Police Scotland to do. If it was,

1		for instance, which we had a lot of, control of the
2		scenes, then it didn't really matter to my mind where
3		these officers come from because they are basically just
4		doing a specific role which, if they were even local
5		officers, it shouldn't compromise that. If they are
6		doing a more important, specific role, then that is
7		probably more of a consideration.
8	Q.	Could you help us understand what a more important role
9		might be?
10	A.	For instance, the initial contact with the family
11		members. Obviously I don't know what went into that as
12		far as selection of the individual officers who
13		ultimately interacted with the family at the early days,
14		but that would be one of them.
15	Q.	Given what you have said, would your preference be that
16		they would come from a separate area outwith Fife?
17	Α.	I would suggest that would be helpful, but maybe
18		impractical. That is the balance and the difficulty.
19	Q.	The Chair has a statement from a Maurice Rhodes. He,
20		I understand, was an investigator?
21	A.	He was, yes.
22	Q.	His statement talks about his experience on 3 May, and
23		he was asked to comment on some other evidence we have
24		heard about Pat Campbell, the SIO. Pat Campbell,
25		I think as you are aware, had described some concerns

1		about PIRC having limited resources?
	-	
2	Α.	Yes, I am aware of that.
3	Q.	You are aware of that as well. I think Pat Campbell in
4		evidence had talked about he had probably about 20 or 22
5		resources at one time from Police Scotland, and they
6		were detective officers involved in the investigations,
7		but he thought that PIRC turned up with four or five.
8		I think you have said it was a total of six?
9	A.	Six, and one elsewhere, yes, seven in total.
10	Q.	And Casey was in Hamilton Police Office?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	So those were Pat Campbell's concerns, and
13		Maurice Rhodes was asked to comment on that, and he says
14		in his statement:
15		"Pat"
16		A reference to Pat Campbell:
17		" his opening comment as we walked into the
18		office that day was"
19		In quotation marks:
20		" 'Ah, it's a Strathclyde Police reunion'."
21		And that was Pat's opening comment.
22		Can you recall Pat Campbell making that comment when
23		you arrived?
24	Α.	Definitely not, no.
25	Q.	Was there a view that day in Kirkcaldy Police Office

1		that the people who arrived from PIRC to do the
2		investigation were from Strathclyde Police?
3	Α.	Not to my knowledge.
4	Q.	Or that
5	Α.	Most of the Fife officers probably would not know them
6		anyway so they wouldn't know the origins of their
7		previous employment, I wouldn't have thought. Obviously
8		Pat Campbell is from the wider Strathclyde force
9		previously and a couple of the others that were there,
10		but the majority were Fife.
11	Q.	So Pat Campbell had worked in Strathclyde?
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	And you had worked in Strathclyde?
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	Who else had worked in Strathclyde at that time that was
16		there?
17	A.	The only ones that didn't were Stuart Taylor and
18		Alex McGuire.
19	Q.	They are the only officers that hadn't
20		investigators that didn't
21	Α.	That didn't work with Strathclyde, yes. Alex McGuire
22		was an ex-officer but not with Strathclyde force.
23	Q.	And Taylor had come from outwith the Police Service
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	you have said that.

1 Can I ask you some questions about another point, a separate point, about Richard Casey. You were asked 2 3 to comment on this in your Inquiry statement, you had 4 noted down something about -- involved with David Green, 5 your involvement, and you had written the words "Political side - Kay?" Do you remember being asked 6 7 about this? No? A. Could you say that again? 8 I will find the passage. Let's look at -- maybe we 9 Q. 10 could look at your notebook PIRC 04528, page 1. You will have to help slightly with the handwriting here, if 11 12 you don't mind. My understanding is that this says and 13 please tell me if I am wrong: "Sunday 3 May 2015 - 10.00 hours. 14 15 "Sunday 10 am - DCI Harrower. "Dave Green~..." 16 17 You can see the names there. And then: "... Instruction?" 18 19 And beneath that it says: 20 "Political side~..." 21 And then: "... Kay?" 22 A. Sorry, what time is that against? 23 Q. It says Sunday 3 May 2015 at 10.00 hours. 10 am. That 24 is what it written there, and then beneath that there is 25

1		a reference to 9.35
2	Α.	Right. That is somebody else's notes.
3	Q.	Let's leave that to one side if that is not your notes.
4		I think you were asked about this in your Inquiry
5		statement, I don't have the number for it, but if you
6		give me a moment I will be able to find it. I think.
7		You say:
8		"I cannot specifically recall why I noted political
9		side down"
10		I think what I will do is I will stop asking
11		questions at this stage and I will find out exactly
12		where this information is from.
13	A.	So I have responded to that, that is probably because
14	Q.	I will come back to this.
15	Α.	I don't know if that is Mr Casey's notes.
16	Q.	I will go back it this at a later stage rather than
17		digging a bigger hole for myself here.
18		Can I turn to the looking at the actual
19		investigation that was carried out on 3 May, and
20		thinking about issues of adequacy and reasonable
21		promptness, I want to go through some of the events in
22		the afternoon with you.
23		We know the first Gold Group meeting, we have heard
24		evidence about this, it was at 11.30 in the morning in
25		Kirkcaldy Police Office and it was chaired by

ACC Nicholson. We have heard evidence that no one from PIRC was in attendance at the first Gold Group meeting in the morning, and I wonder if we can ask you to explain a little bit more about why nobody from PIRC went to that meeting?

I wouldn't have been able to get there in the timescale, 6 Α. 7 that would have been the main thing. If you look at the initial time spent on various phone calls and organising 8 9 things, speaking with PSDs, speaking with Pat Campbell, 10 then considering what additional staff we had to call out, that is taking us to a point where, even taking 11 12 travelling distance if there was a potential to go 13 straight from my residence to there, we would never have got there for 11.30 anyway. 14

Q. Can you give the Chair an indication of how long it normally takes to mobilise PIRC and to mobilise a team to attend an investigation?

That would be very difficult to estimate because every 18 Α. circumstance is difference. Obviously the big point is 19 20 the geographical location of where you are going, if you 21 have other resources to bring out who are not on call, 22 they may be harder to get, depending on where they are. So for instance the two additional investigators 23 I called out were specifically to carry out senior 24 management functions. If they are not in the house, 25

1 they are doing something with their family, then -- but 2 they are the only ones you are going to be able to get 3 then it's going to take longer, so you could never 4 really estimate how long it would take. There is 5 an accumulation of factors there that will change the 6 timescale for a response. 7 Q. So on the particular day in question, 3 May, you have had your initial call at 9.35 from David Green, you have 8 9 had a number of other calls, we have spoken about some 10 of those today --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- in relation to the investigation. And was there 13 simply not anyone available to go to Kirkcaldy Police Office at that stage? 14 15 Α. No, there was -- obviously the on-call team that were 16 scheduled to be on-call were contacted and notified, 17 I don't recall whether I got them on the first phone 18 call or not but within a reasonable timescale I got 19 a response and organised for them to mobilise and come 20 out and then got the additional members of staff, the 21 two, to add to that on-call team as well. 22 Do you as a practice arrive in an office or at Q. an incident together as a group when you arrive from 23 PIRC or do you arrive individually, or is there no 24

25 preference?

1	Α.	There is no real preference. The majority of the times
2		we would be travelling probably two to a car, so you may
3		arrive kind of roughly the same time but you may be
4		diverted to do something en route or you may be required
5		at another location, so again there is various
6		permutations of how you would deploy and the reasons
7		behind that.
8	Q.	Are the cars kept at Hamilton, at your offices there?
9	Α.	At that time I think we had certain ones that the
10		on-call team had but obviously we had other members of
11		staff coming out that didn't have cars, so there would
12		be a requirement to organise additional transportation
13		that would be sitting at Hamilton stored near the office
14		and then any other equipment or on-call material to deal
15		with the likes of taking productions and so on and so
16		forth.
17	Q.	Did anyone consider joining the Gold Group meeting by
18		phone?
19	Α.	No, we didn't and obviously we didn't have facility,
20		now we quite regularly join by Teams, which wasn't
21		an option back then.
22	Q.	But is that something you more commonly do now?
23	Α.	Yes, in fact it's particularly if there is
24		a deployment of staff, maybe a DSI will go out with
25		a team and one or the other DSIs or

1		a senior investigator will log into the Gold Group
2		meeting, so~
3	Q.	Are there benefits to PIRC being present at all the
4		Gold Group meetings, especially the first one?
5	Α.	You obviously get you would hope you would get more
6		first-hand information and inputs from other police
7		managers as opposed to all that information being
8		channelled through one person. So I would say probably
9		advantages from that.
10	Q.	When you say one person, is that the SIO you mean
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	having the contact with you?
13		Tell us, not having been there, how did you then go
14		about getting information about what was said at that
15		first Gold Group meeting?
16	Α.	By speaking to Pat Campbell.
17	Q.	Did you receive copies of minutes at any stage?
18	Α.	Not to my recollection I don't think they would have
19		been although they would have been handwritten but
20		they would later be typed and compiled into a formal
21		minute, so I didn't see those at those times.
22	Q.	So were you dependent on Pat Campbell's recollection or
23		his own notes of the first Gold Group meeting.
24	Α.	Yes, at that stage, yes.
25	Q.	Do you remember if you were told anything or given

1		an update about family concerns at that time?
2	A.	At the Gold Group meeting
3	Q.	In relation to the first Gold Group meeting?
4	A.	Obviously I was well aware, I think at the second one,
5		of the family concerns and what was fed back from the
6		visits to the house. I am not sure about prior to that.
7	Q.	Was there do you remember now if there was much
8		discussion between you and Pat Campbell about what had
9		been said at the first Gold Group meeting?
10	A.	I am sorry I can't recall specifics on that. I am sure
11		he would have mentioned that but
12	Q.	All right. You have mentioned in your statement about
13		there being a briefing in Hamilton at your PIRC office?
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	And that would be just before midday that day?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	Was that for all the investigators who were going to be
18		involved in the investigation?
19	A.	Yes, and Ricky Casey as well.
20	Q.	And Richard Casey. I think you say in your second
21		statement at paragraph 43 you didn't ask investigators
22		to attended directly to Kirkcaldy Police Office and that
23		was the most appropriate response. Can you explain why
24		you didn't simply ask them all to attend at Kirkcaldy?
25	A.	I touched on the equipment and the vehicles and I wanted

1		to brief them prior to arriving at Kirkcaldy as well
2		because you never know how that is going to play out,
3		what could be available to do that, you may never get
4		the opportunity to actually do it with whatever has
5		taken place, so you could stand and look at it both ways
6		that you could have sent somebody immediately or that
7		that is what I decided to do on the day.
8	Q.	What equipment was necessary to be picked up or
9		collected?
10	Α.	You have a lot of what we call a production kit, which
11		is labels, bags, swabs, anything that the scene
12		managers could go into a lot more detail on what type of
13		material they would take with them.
14	Q.	Do you have a note anywhere of what was said at that
15		briefing?
16	A.	No.
17	Q.	There's no details of that in your operational notes?
18	A.	No. That was basically just done as an overview,
19		a summary of the information that I had been provided
20		from the three different sources at that stage.
21	Q.	Did you prepare any paperwork in advance of
22		the briefing
23	A.	No, not at that stage, no.
24	Q.	setting out what you were going to say here?
25	A.	No, that would obviously have taken more time to do that

1 as well. 2 When you were giving the briefing did you rely on your Q. 3 operational notes to speak to the other investigators? 4 Α. Yes, partly, yes. So the information that was in your operational notes 5 Q. may have been shared with those other --6 7 Α. Yes, verbally not physically I wouldn't have thought as in the notes themselves. But, yes. 8 Q. We have a statement from Alex McGuire who you have 9 10 mentioned today, paragraph 20. I won't ask for it to be put on the screen, but he has noted down: 11 12 "Upon arrival encountered the suspect who ran 13 a female officer and attacked her wielding a knife." 14 Again, does that sound similar to the sort of note 15 you had in your operational notes that were being 16 shared? So again, it would appear that the story or the 17 version of the subject being the aggressor seems to have been shared with all of the investigators from PIRC? 18 19 It wasn't -- it wasn't to convey it, it was just Α. 20 conveying a summary of the information that I had been 21 provided. There was no intention to -- you know, to 22 paint that picture, it was just that was the information we had. 23 24 Q. So that information again was shared with the 25 investigators who were going to be involved?

1	A.	Yes, it was.
2	Q.	And that was Richard Casey who was present, although he
3		remained in Hamilton
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	Alex McGuire, Garry Sinclair, John Ferguson,
6		Stuart Taylor and Maurice Rhodes?
7	A.	I am sure I conveyed to them at that time what my
8		initial thoughts were on what they would be deployed to
9		do, so that was another consideration for them to be
10		aware of that, before they got there, so they could
11		focus their minds on how they were going to approach
12		that depending on what they were faced with when they
13		arrived.
14	Q.	What did you say about what they were going to be doing?
15		This was around midday on 3 May.
16	Α.	Yes, was
17	Q.	Was it individual tasks for each of them or was it
18		a general overview?
19	A.	It was tasks as pairings for the scene at Hayfield Road
20		and at the hospital. Basically Alex McGuire was going
21		to support me, we spoke about the scribe role earlier
22		on, that was one of the things just to assist me in
23		retaining any of the information that was being passed
24		at the various meetings.
25	Q.	Did you explain to them about the split, the parallel

1		investigation at that time?
2	Α.	I don't think so, no. No.
3	Q.	What impression did you give those investigators in
4		relation to the scope of the investigation that was to
5		be done by PIRC, if you didn't explain the split?
6	Α.	I spoke about the responsibilities for each of those two
7		locations, but we obviously were going to find out more
8		of what particularly for Hayfield Road, what else
9		that would involve, and that subsequently there was
10		other tasks that were added in relation to
11		Garry Sinclair's role as the scene manager for that
12		scene, and things that had to be accomplished at the
13		Kirkcaldy office as well as that scene.
14	Q.	Did you make it clear to those investigators, when you
15		were talking about the information that you had received
16		about the events, that you had not asked and did not
17		know the source of that information?
18	Α.	I don't think that was something I would have mentioned.
19	Q.	Did you make it clear to them that you could not provide
20		any assurances as to the accuracy of that information?
21	Α.	I don't have any recollection of that. That is
22		probably not. Unless there was a specific reason, it's
23		maybe not something I would mention anyway at that
24		stage.
25	Q.	Did you encourage them to keep an open mind in relation

1		to the investigation?
2	Α.	Very much so, and we would as I say, we would always
3		do that, particularly in, you know, these types of
4		investigations.
5	Q.	These were the many of these investigators, we have
6		heard their names before, some will have taken
7		statements from the officers early in June, at a later
8		stage?
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	So some of them will have been involved in the
11		investigation for a number of weeks at least?
12	Α.	For a prolonged period, yes.
13	Q.	Can you help us understand why Casey,
14		a senior investigator, did not travel to Kirkcaldy
15		Police Office with the other investigators?
16	Α.	That was a decision he made to he was going to deal
17		with the media issues and anything else that would
18		arise.
19	Q.	Because he was a senior investigator that day
20	Α.	That is correct.
21	Q.	wasn't he? There was no one else there in Kirkcaldy
22		that was of the same seniority as him
23	Α.	No.
24	Q.	on 3 May?
25	Α.	No.

1 Q. You were a deputy senior investigator?

- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. We've got some other information in a statement that has been signed and available to the Chair that he -although he said he would man phones, Irene Scullion may actually have been manning phones; do you know anything about that?
- A. I can't remember. I know she was in the office the
 following day, I can't honestly recall whether she came
 into the office on the Sunday or not. I am not sure,
 I know she was made aware of the incident, I am quite
 sure of that.
- Q. Would there have been benefit in Ricky Casey travelling to Kirkcaldy and becoming a sort of seventh investigator at Kirkcaldy Police Office that day, so visible in Kirkcaldy? Would there have been some benefit to having him present?
- 18 A. There may have been.
- Q. Did he have any particular skills that might have beenof use to PIRC that day?

A. As I mentioned earlier, he was one of the PIM-trained
people, but obviously as far as we were concerned at
that stage it hadn't gone to that level. But he is
a very experienced investigator in his own right.
Q. If he had been present would that maybe have released

1		someone else from a task to to do something in
2		addition, maybe rely less on Police Scotland?
3	A.	Possibly.
4	Q.	Do you think an extra pair of hands would have been
5		helpful to your investigation?
6	Α.	It will always the priorities and tasks that I was
7		setting was dependent on what we had there and what
8		Police Scotland resources were considered appropriate
9		and necessary to undertake those.
10	Q.	We have heard that you arrived at Kirkcaldy at half past
11		one or thereabouts?
12	A.	Thereabouts, yes.
13	Q.	When you arrived did you make yourselves known
14		Police Scotland?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	How did you go about doing that?
17	Α.	I think I sought out Pat Campbell because he had been
18		the senior officer that I had been speaking to.
19	Q.	Do you remember where Pat Campbell was when you arrived
20		at Kirkcaldy?
21	A.	Not specifically, no. He was clearly for obvious
22		reasons he was a man in high demand with, you know,
23		various people constantly seeking direction, so I sort
24		of spoke to him intermittently at different stages.
25	Q.	Where were you when you first spoke to him?

1	Α.	We were I don't know where it is more likely we
2		were at a very early stage given a small office in the
3		building somewhere, I don't recall where that was.
4		I think it was quite close to where Colin Robson was,
5		I think, so it is maybe it was part of the CID
6		corridor at the time. I am not sure. But I think it
7		was either there or somewhere close to there, and then
8		at some stage I think in some sort of meeting room we
9		had the handover that you described.
10	Q.	Did you remain in or around that office?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	You didn't spread out in the police station?
13	Α.	No, until the rest of the team were sent out to carry
14		out their various tasks because I am sure the forensic
15		strategy meeting that we had with Stuart Houston was
16		I am sure in the same office as well later on.
17	Q.	So how long did you remain in that office that day,
18		initially at least?
19	Α.	For a fair period on and off. I was back and forward
20		and then obviously in attendance at the Gold Group
21		meetings which I think were in a bigger room upstairs,
22		I think.
23	Q.	Apart from the forensic strategy meeting and the
24		Gold Group meetings, did you remain largely in the
25		office apart from that or were you elsewhere as well?

1	Α.	I was elsewhere at times but I spent a fair bit of time
2		in there and was on the computer, and was writing up
3		stuff as well, you are aware that the briefing document
4		that was concluded, I did parts of that while I was
5		there.
6	Q.	We will come on to that. I think in your statement you
7		talk about tasking the investigators to manage the
8		hospital, Victoria Hospital?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And Hayfield Road?
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	And that was in conjunction with the Police Scotland
13		scene manager, DCI Stuart Houston?
14	A.	Yes, he was the co-ordinator for all the Police Scotland
15		scene managers.
16	Q.	When did you task officers in relation to the hospital?
17	A.	Our investigators were going were aware they were
18		going to be dealing with that from Hamilton.
19	Q.	From the briefing?
20	A.	Yes, from the briefing originally and then that was
21		reinforced at different stages, particularly following
22		the forensic strategy meeting and how the deceased was
23		going to be dealt with and how we would approach that.
24	Q.	We have heard about a forensic strategy meeting in the
25		afternoon. I may be incorrect in my recollection but it

1		was roughly around 4 o'clock or something like that?
2		Someone will correct me if I am totally wrong on that.
3		Was it after that forensic strategy meeting in any event
4		that the officers were told to deal with the hospital
5	Α.	Yes.
6	Q.	and Hayfield Road?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	Was there any reason you waited for the forensic
9		strategy meeting to take place first?
10	Α.	Because it is important to plan out these things, you
11		only get one opportunity, I think we had to get an input
12		from the Police Scotland scene management side because
13		they had particularly with well, both locations
14		but particularly Hayfield Road, you are aware there was
15		a lot went on at that scene from the first stages and
16		items were recovered etc, so Garry Sinclair, who was
17		taking the lead at that location, it was important that
18		he was aware of everything that had gone before,
19		particularly from the scene managers, and then taking
20		that forward how we were going to implement and finish
21		off that process.
22		So there is a lot involved in doing that, and
23		getting it right Because it might sound funny that

22 getting it right. Because it might sound funny that 24 there is no hurry but these scenes are locked down, that 25 is the purpose of maintaining the Police Scotland

1		officers there to secure that, so that gives you the
2		time to prepare properly, and have a plan of action, and
3		how you are actually going to deal with that.
4	Q.	Then what were your expectations after you have had
5		the strategy meeting what were your expectations in
6		relation to the officers going to these scenes, to
7		Hayfield Road and to Victoria Hospital; how long would
8		that take them?
9	Α.	After they left? A considerable period of time.
10	Q.	Why would that
11	Α.	A long period because there was a lot to do. Plus
12		Garry Sinclair, who was responsible at Hayfield Road,
13		was delegated to deal, to oversee the equipment from the
14		officers, we saw the importance of the PAVA canisters
15		etc, and part of that strategy meeting was an insistence
16		that these were weighed properly to give us an idea on
17		how much of that substance had been discharged during
18		the incident. That wasn't initially a consideration, as
19		far as I was aware, from the Police Scotland side.
20		So there was a lot more from actually the physical
21		Hayfield Road scene itself but what was to be
22		accomplished at the office, and then there was obviously
23		other enquiries ongoing as regards house-to-house, which
24		I had discussed with Pat Campbell, and a decision made
25		to let that run as it was at that time to make sure that

1 we could identify any significant witnesses, that there was a requirement to again establish the facts of any 2 3 independent witnesses in the absence of the police 4 accounts at the beginning. 5 Of the investigators you tasked with going to Q. Victoria Hospital, what was the strategy that was agreed 6 7 at the meeting in relation to that? It was various things discussed as regards what -- how 8 Α. 9 the recovery would take place, if any samples were to be 10 taken prior to leaving the hospital, getting the body to the hospital in the manner -- and how that was going to 11 12 be done. So these things, they all take a long time to 13 achieve properly. What were your expectations of the officers tasked with 14 Q. 15 dealing with the hospital about how long after the 16 forensic strategy meeting it would take them to get to the hospital? 17 18 Α. I am fairly -- I think it was fairly soon thereafter. I don't have exact times for that. 19 Looking back now, do you think -- because the Chair 20 Q. 21 would like perhaps to make recommendations in the 22 future, do you think there's ways that the response time of the investigators could be improved in terms of, we 23 have heard the incident happened and Mr Bayoh had been 24 taken by ambulance roughly around half past seven in the 25

1 mornings, you've had a call at 9.35 from David Green, life is pronounced extinct in relation to Mr Bayoh at 2 3 09.04, and you don't arrive to Kirkcaldy until 1.30. Do 4 you think there is a way that that process could be made 5 more efficient, speeded up, faster? Is there anything that could be done to help speed that up? 6 7 I think there could be. And, as I say, now the approach Α. would be slightly difference, we spoke about the initial 8 9 Gold Group meeting, which would facilitate that early 10 communication on a lot of these things that we have discussed and that would be done -- we would have had 11 12 somebody at least on Teams now logging in to that 13 meeting, so that dialogue would take place so it would 14 be clearer to Police Scotland what was actually 15 happening. We obviously have a lot more staff now, significantly more staff than --16 How many? 17 Q. 18 -- we did then. I think we had total of about 25 at Α. 19 that time. We've now got in excess of 60. So arguably 20 the availability of individuals and the skilled 21 personnel that you need for these incidents would -- may 22 be more readily available, although the on-call teams are pretty much the same. It's the same numbers, and 23 then if you have to outsource further to try and get our 24 25 own skilled personnel then that would be subject to

1 being able to contact them and call them out. 2 Can you see any way of minimising or reducing the period Q. 3 of time between PIRC getting the call to become involved 4 and do an investigation and actually getting people on 5 site? The approach now, and it has been for a few years, is 6 Α. 7 completely different, because any incident like this would fall into a formal post-incident process. So you 8 9 would have the list that you ran over from that previous 10 document of, you know, the senior investigators, the deputy senior investigators; they would all be involved 11 12 in this very quickly. If we couldn't get to the 13 post-incident process, again we would remotely go into 14 that so that that process would start, we would have the 15 checklist of things in relation to the conferring and the recovering of relevant material, including basic 16 17 facts and initial accounts, so that is a process that is 18 done very, very regularly now, and works very well. 19 Let's just take and moment and look at this. The Q. 20 document we looked at this morning, PIRC 04438. It's 21 the final page of that document. It says: 22 "Minimum deployment of PIRC personnel." Are you saying that nowadays that would be the 23 minimum deployment? 24 Yes, so you would have at least two going to the 25 Α.

1		post-incident process, you would have the PIM-aware
2		investigator included within that, so and the ability
3		to take productions, etc, through that process. You
4		then have a PIRC manager who would be involved in charge
5		of the scene or scenes, with appropriate staff. If you
6		had a number of scenes, then there would be more staff
7		there to deal with those and they would link in with
8		Police Scotland at the appropriate level.
9	Q.	But in May of 2015 obviously we can see that there's
10		at the scene there are five individuals envisaged
11		there
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	as a minimum deployment, and for PIM suite there is
14		four, so that is a total of nine envisaged as a minimum
15		deployment
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	in this document. And we know that you had six.
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	When you arrived with six investigators in Kirkcaldy
20		in May 2015 did you already feel you were perhaps not
21		meeting the minimum deployment that is envisaged?
22	A.	But that again is in relation to the firearms
23		discharge-type scenario. The post-incident process was
24		something that didn't occur that often at all at that
25		stage. I think from the stuff I have heard even

1 Police Scotland knowledge, even at a senior level, was 2 very limited on how that process worked. If this had 3 been determined as a full post-incident process then 4 potentially the resourcing levels would have been 5 different to facilitate that. Q. If we go back to page 1 and we see that firearms include 6 7 the discharge of CS gas, if you keep going down page 1, we will see the four bullet points and the final one is, 8 "Discharge of CS gas". So on the face of it, it would 9 10 appear that where there has been a discharge of gas the minimum deployment is those nine individuals. 11 12 Α. I don't assess it as that. I don't agree with that. 13 I think in the first paragraph we will see that it's -the wording of it is a fatal --14 15 Q. We can go to the top, there is firearms mentioned and that is the definition of firearms? 16 Because of the legislation the discharge of PAVA or 17 Α. 18 CS spray is classified in that manner. However, we get 19 hundreds of these referrals every year to deal with as 20 a single entity after -- so that is classified as being 21 discharged but it is not at that level. To my mind this 22 is directed towards, you know, a lethal barrelled weapon being discharged and potentially somebody being fatally 23 24 shot. 25 Q. So in May of 2015 your impression was that this document

- 1didn't really have any bearing on the situation you were2in?
- It was designed, as it says in the heading, for 3 Α. 4 following police use of firearms and I know what you are 5 saying about during this incident PAVA was discharged but to my mind that is not what that is intended for. 6 7 This -- that is the kind of highest level and now all death investigations -- most of them will involve that 8 9 process now because the whole process was changed and 10 where a post-incident process would be implemented in response to that, but that was some of the significant 11 12 changes after the incident in 2015.
- Q. So nowadays it is quite clear that it would be applicable to any death investigation, not just one involving a firearm or --
- A. Not any death investigation, but certainly a death in
 custody would definitely be. Death following police
 contact would be slightly different where it's -- you
 know, it's removed from direct interaction with the
 officers, when the death occurs.
- Q. Can I ask you about the officers arriving at
 Victoria Hospital. So we have heard evidence that they
 didn't arrive until nearer 7 o'clock in the evening and
 I'm wondering if you have any concerns about the length
 of time that it took PIRC officers to actually get to

1 Victoria Hospital?

2 I think after the strategy meeting, you know, they would Α. 3 be further engaged with the Police Scotland scene 4 managers that had the initial responsibility for those 5 two scenes, so there was probably a lot to achieve after that. As I say, I have said already, these -- both of 6 7 these locations were secured, they were stood by, by police officers, and had been since 7 o'clock in the 8 9 morning. So that position shouldn't have changed. So 10 yes, would it have been better if it had been earlier? Absolutely. But it should be the same, what they are 11 12 faced with when they arrive, whether it's two hours 13 later, so ... 14 Did you have any concerns at that time about Q. 15 preservation of evidence and a delay in getting PIRC there having an impact on maybe not being able to 16 17 preserve the best evidence?

A. For the same reasons, no. I would be happy that these
locations were secured, had been for, you know, two or
three hours before we were even made aware and then
subsequently over that period.

Q. Did you later become aware that when PIRC arrived at the hospital they realised that the police officers had been sitting in a room with Mr Bayoh's body without forensic clothing?

1	A.	I don't think I was aware of that. I heard that through
2		the Inquiry itself.
3	Q.	Did you become aware at any stage about issues to do
4		with samples and bags perhaps lying open, anything like
5		that?
6	A.	I don't recall that, no.
7	Q.	Again, thinking to the future, is there a way that you
8		could see that the response time could be improved?
9		Obviously Mr Bayoh was pronounced life extinct at 09.04,
10		PIRC didn't arrive at the hospital until 7 o'clock that
11		evening. Is there a way that that period could be
12		reduced?
13	A.	It probably could.
14	Q.	Any suggestions that you could make?
15	A.	It depends as I say, I decided to have that briefing
16		at Hamilton. Could it have been different where we
17		identified well, we did identify who the scene
18		manager was going to be, that they were deployed
19		directly to that with contact details for the respective
20		scene managers, but then we are still in a position
21		there are so many different scenes being managed that we
22		would still want to have that forensic strategy meeting
23		with all the relevant people involved in that, before we
24		actually went to do that recovery work. So I see the
25		perception as regards time delays but it is more

important to get the approach correct and then carry out
 that properly.

In terms of looking at ways that the process could be 3 Q. 4 made more efficient, quicker, can you think of anything 5 that would be able to speed things up? You are still dealing with an on-call situation. It's 6 Α. 7 the availability of people, the on-call staff, again they are not all sitting in the house ready to respond 8 9 to the phone sometimes. You know, they will respond but 10 they may be somewhere else, so there is an awful lot of different factors which will affect that time delay. 11 12 But that is for us to manage, and make it as effective 13 as possible.

Q. Obviously once the investigators arrived at Kirkcaldy at 1.30, and didn't arrive to the hospital until seven, can you see in that window an opportunity for making the process faster? Obviously they are in Kirkcaldy by then, there is no issues about them journeying from home; can you think of any efficiencies?

A. It is hard it comment without knowing all the factors in
relation to that, the scene managers are given a very
significant responsibility because they have expertise
in what they are do, their expertise is much better than
mine in relation to that specific task. So if they see
fit to say have that further dialogue and preparation

1	and planning to make that recovery at either scene as
2	professional and thorough as possible, without any
3	outside interference, then we just have to accept that.
4	But there will always be ways of improving timescales
5	around things and that would maybe normally involve more
6	resources as well.
7	Q. So you think perhaps more resources, if you had had them
8	that day, might have helped speed up the process?
9	A. Might have done, yes.
10	MS GRAHAME: I am conscious of the time. We often have
11	a break for the stenographer.
12	LORD BRACADALE: We will take a 15-minute break now.
13	(3.00 pm)
14	(A short break)
Τī	
15	(3.15 pm)
15	(3.15 pm)
15 16	(3.15 pm) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
15 16 17	(3.15 pm) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Just before the break you talked
15 16 17 18	<pre>(3.15 pm) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Just before the break you talked about how the resources have you think additional</pre>
15 16 17 18 19	<pre>(3.15 pm) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Just before the break you talked about how the resources have you think additional resources on 3 May may have made things faster.</pre>
15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>(3.15 pm) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Just before the break you talked about how the resources have you think additional resources on 3 May may have made things faster. Response time. You have also talked about you had</pre>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>(3.15 pm) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Just before the break you talked about how the resources have you think additional resources on 3 May may have made things faster. Response time. You have also talked about you had 25 staff at the time in PIRC. You now have about 60</pre>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>(3.15 pm) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Just before the break you talked about how the resources have you think additional resources on 3 May may have made things faster. Response time. You have also talked about you had 25 staff at the time in PIRC. You now have about 60 I think you said.</pre>

1 with a recognition that PIRC needed more resources to 2 perhaps be more efficient? Mainly to do with workload, I think. There has been 3 Α. 4 a significant increase over the previous few years, 5 which has been identified I think and then appropriate funding was sought to increase the workload, and 6 7 a change of type of work that we have which has increased that quite significantly. 8 So in any individual investigation would it be similar 9 Q. 10 numbers today that are deployed to deal with that investigation? If the situation on 3 May 2015 happened 11 12 now, would more officers be sent or the same numbers? 13 I would say more, because we would initially have to Α. 14 resource the post-incident process. So that in itself 15 would be a prerequisite to supplement the on-call staff with additional resources and then assess what else was 16 17 required or would be perceived as required for that part of that initial response. So the chances are it would 18 19 be a lot more. When you say "a lot more", if it happened today how many 20 Q. 21 investigators were PIRC would go to the police office?

A. It would depend a lot -- as we said, we spoke about the post-incident process in isolation itself. We have instances where we have more than one, so we have to send the numbers that were on that documentation that we

1 looked at to each of those and then, if we have more than one scene or locus, then likewise we would need to 2 3 resource that with supervisors and with appropriately 4 skilled staff, and any other -- as I say, any other 5 requirements we thought we would have for that. LORD BRACADALE: I think the realtime transcription is not 6 7 working but I think we will just carry on and the stenographer can catch up, and we will see how it 8 9 develops. 10 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. So if you were appointed as lead 11 investigator today in a similar situation, can you help 12 the Chair by giving him some understanding of the number 13 of PIRC investigators that would be sent in a similar 14 situation today, assuming there was a post-incident 15 procedure in place? There would be. If it was a significant critical 16 Α. 17 incident, then there would be a post-incident process. 18 So you would have -- at least two would go to carry out 19 the process within the post-incident procedure. As 20 I say, we would potentially have three or four would go 21 to each location. A senior investigator would be in 22 charge of overseeing these scenes and linking in with the Police Scotland as well. You may have parallel 23 criminal investigations ongoing. It may be part of 24 25 an ongoing crime in action where somebody has been shot

1 for instance, but there is still police involvement in that but there is a role for us to investigate that 2 shooting as well. So there are various permutations 3 4 where the level and number of resources could increase, 5 just depending on what it is and what we are faced with. Q. So in a situation like existed on 3 May 2015, where 6 7 a man has been restrained by the police, there are nine attending officers who have been involved as witnesses, 8 9 there is the scene where it happened, Hayfield Road. 10 There is the hospital where the body remains, Victoria Hospital. How many PIRC investigators would be 11 12 sent -- to Hayfield Road for example, let's start with 13 Hayfield Road? Again, it would depend on that and location what -- the 14 Α. 15 perceived level of involvement, what enquiries may be 16 coming from that. LORD BRACADALE: Mr Harrower, I think you are being asked to 17 18 look at the situation as it was on 3 May 2015, and indicate what resources would be sent to the same 19 situation, or a similar situation, today. 20 21 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 22 I think you potentially have two senior investigators, Α. one to oversee the post-incident process, one to link 23 between the two scenes. You would have scene managers 24 for each plus another investigator. You would I think 25

1 at least have another couple looking at other parts of 2 the investigation. It may be that you would potentially 3 start the house-to-house enquiry as we did, but 4 Police Scotland were doing that on our behalf but we may 5 decide depending on the circumstances to initiate that ourselves. Obviously we would have the question of the 6 7 family liaison officers, whether they were deployed at that time or they were initially deployed by 8 9 Police Scotland with a follow-up. That would be another 10 consideration at that stage as well. So I don't have the benefit of the transcript, but you 11 Q. 12 spoke about perhaps having two senior investigators 13 engaged with --Potentially. You know, a very critical incident. 14 Α. 15 You said "and with the investigators", would that be Q. each senior investigator would have a further 16 investigator to assist? 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 And would there also be a scribe for each Q. 20 senior investigator? 21 Α. There would probably be a scribe with each of them, then 22 you would have your two investigators that are dealing with the scene, so it might be two senior investigators 23 or certainly an experienced senior investigator with 24 25 AN Other for each of those scenes well.

1	Q.	Would there be production officers or investigators
2		appointed to the role of production officer
3	Α.	Possibly
4	Q.	at each scene?
5	Α.	but the way that worked during this was that they
6		would deal with the productions for their own scene
7		potentially but if there was perceived there was going
8		to be a lot involved in it, you may have separate
9		production officers out as a separate resource.
10	Q.	We have heard reference to the scene manager, like
11		a PIRC scene manager, would that be in addition to these
12		investigators?
13	Α.	No.
14	Q.	They would take on that role?
15	Α.	Yes, the scene managers are investigators who have that
16		specific skill base.
17	Q.	You may initiate house-to-house, would that involve two
18		investigators?
19	Α.	To do a house-to-house properly, I think we follow
20		I don't know how many PIRC investigators are involved in
21		that. I think that started the following day, there
22		would be a lot more than two. There would be
23		a significant number involved in that.
24	ο.	You mention FLOs, how many investigators would take on
	٧.	Tou mention filos, now many investigators would take on

1	Α.	Two.
2	Q.	So there would be two FLOs as well?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	Anyone else that I have missed out?
5	Α.	I don't think so.
6	Q.	So there could be a significantly large number if PIRC
7		were to take over. If the investigation by PIRC now
8		involved the events leading up to Mr Bayoh's arrival at
9		Hayfield Road, would there be additional investigators
10		appointed to deal with other scenes and other parts of
11		the investigation?
12	Α.	I don't think in the circumstances still PIRC would be
13		able to do that exclusively, I don't think, in those
14		early stages, and particularly where houses were being
15		locked down etc, as I am aware. So they would have to
16		have the assistance of Police Scotland to do that.
17	Q.	So that type of part of the investigation would still
18		have to you would have to rely on the support of
19		Police Scotland
20	Α.	The support, yes.
21	Q.	officers? Thank you.
22		We were talking about the arrival of PIRC at various
23		locations. I would like to talk about the arrival of
24		PIRC investigators at the scene at Hayfield Road on

25 3 May 2015. Now, they arrived at 7.20 in the evening,

1 so effectively 12 hours after the police first arrived at Hayfield Road on the Sunday morning. 2 3 Looking at that period of 12 hours, you have talked 4 about the police had the scene, they had Hayfield Road, 5 we have heard evidence from officers about the police taking control and if I can say setting up cordons, but 6 7 making sure that the area was kept free of members of the public. Do you have any concerns about that period 8 9 being -- before PIRC get there being as long as 10 12 hours? Say for example in relation to forensic recovery of items from the scene, are you concerned 11 12 about that? I think my answer would be very similar to -- in 13 Α. 14 relation to Victoria Hospital, where I am greatly 15 reliant on the scene managers and their expertise, and the preparations that they need to make to do 16 17 a professional job of recovering any available evidence 18 that is at the scene. If they could have been there any 19 earlier, in my view they would have been there. Are you concerned at all about the perception of 20 Q. 21 officers in uniform at the scene, so from the public 22 point of view, although PIRC are supposed to be

independent and taking charge of the investigation, at
the actual scene itself the public see officers in
uniform, Police Scotland officers, not PIRC

1 investigators. Do you think that causes concern 2 generally?

I can understand potentially to some degree the adverse 3 Α. 4 perception of that, but it doesn't cause me concern as 5 such because to control these scenes in the main requires police support because there is an abundance of 6 7 issues that PIRC investigators wouldn't be able to deal with that may arise with people trying to cross that 8 9 scene and then whatever action would have to be taken as 10 a result of that, so~... And, as we discussed, the powers of constable that our investigators have which 11 12 doesn't include members of the public, so we would then have to seek assistance of Police Scotland then and it 13 14 may be too late that something has actually happened and 15 the scene has been breached.

I asked you before about thinking of ways that 16 Q. 17 efficiencies or time savings could be made and I am wondering if, looking at that situation now, you have 18 told us that you arrived at Kirkcaldy with the 19 20 investigators at 1.30, you had given them a briefing in 21 advance of that and told them what they were going to be 22 doing, so officers had been allocated to attend Hayfield Road. But the officers didn't actually arrive 23 until 7.20 in the evening. Looking at that response 24 25 time now, do you think there are ways that that could

1 have been quicker, that they could have got there
2 sooner?

There is one thing I didn't mention as far as 3 Α. 4 Hayfield Road is Garry Sinclair, the scene manager who was tasked to control that, also his role extended to 5 various tasks at Kirkcaldy. So I think -- maybe 6 7 double-check his statement, but I think he had to deal with the recovery of the police safety equipment, 8 9 uniforms etc. Now that was initially -- I was told in 10 the morning that was ongoing before I got there but that transpired not to be the case, so I think him and 11 12 Maurice Rhodes, I think it was, were involved in that 13 for probably a significant period before they ultimately 14 linked in with the scene managers at Hayfield Road 15 itself, so that might have answered part of that.

So the further answer to your question then may have been resource-wise that, you know, if there had been another pairing available that could have dealt with everything at the office which would have released them earlier to go to that.

21 Q. So another pairing, extra investigators --

A. Could have dealt with the various tasks at KirkcaldyPolice Station.

Q. So if there had been another pair of hands, or anotherbody, you could have allocated roles separately?

1 Α. Yes. Just to ask you about the recovery of clothing or 2 Q. 3 equipment from the officers, when did you become aware 4 that the officers had returned to Kirkcaldy Police Office? 5 A. I would think the first discussion I had with 6 7 Pat Campbell, I think. I don't think -- certainly I don't think it came up in conversation with PSDs, so 8 it would be shortly after with Pat Campbell. 9 10 Q. Did you know they were in the canteen? Not at that stage, I don't think. I assumed they were 11 Α. 12 at the office. 13 When did you become aware they were at the canteen? Q. 14 Later in the day. I can't be specific with times. Α. 15 I think it was after we arrived at the office, I think. After 1.30? 16 Q. 17 Yes. Α. 18 Q. Was it after a Gold Group meeting or was it after some 19 other event? 20 Honestly, I am not sure. I can't remember. Α. 21 Q. You said you were under the impression earlier that the equipment was going to be recovered? 22 Yes, much earlier, yes. 23 Α. 24 What time? Q. I think it is mentioned in my notes, it's possibly the 25 Α.

1		first conversation that I had with Pat Campbell, that
2		that was the inference was that was ongoing at that
3		time, which was the back of 10 o'clock.
4	Q.	What were your expectations then about what would be
5		happening with the officers' clothing and their
6		equipment; what were you expecting to happen?
7	Α.	From what I was told, that would have been all secured,
8		packaged, and be retained.
9	Q.	When you say secured, what do you mean?
10	Α.	Sealed in bags. Following the appropriate processes for
11		recovery of
12	Q.	We have seen some of these brown bags with a clear strip
13		that are sealed, forensic, that type of thing.
14	Α.	Yes, similar to that, and identification of who has
15		taken it and what it is and who it belongs to.
16	Q.	Thank you. And "retained", what do you mean by
17		"retained"?
18	Α.	It would be kept and passed to us.
19	Q.	In terms of ensuring the forensic integrity or
20		recovering evidence in a forensically secure way, is
21		that the type of thing you would be expecting to be done
22		with equipment?
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	And clothing?
25	Α.	Yes.

1	Q.	We have heard evidence that when the officers returned
2		to Kirkcaldy, that clothing, vests, equipment, was left
3		out in the canteen?
4	Α.	I am aware of that, yes.
5	Q.	You are aware of that from the Inquiry, are you?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	If you are aware of that, do you have concerns about
8		that?
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	Can you tell us about those concerns?
11	Α.	Obviously the preference that these were again, that
12		is something that we would have covered in the
13		post-incident process, if it was seen as a requirement
14		or necessity to take that, that that would have been
15		dealt with in a much more forensic fashion at an early
16		stage. But from what I have seen that didn't occur at
17		that stage.
18		As I say, Garry Sinclair and his colleague were
19		involved, I think I don't know what stage it was at
20		as regards when he got involved in the recovery of that,
21		but it obviously hadn't happened on the timescale that
22		had been initially intimated to me. So the fact that
23		you know, if that was as reported, lying about
24		the canteen in different places and it wasn't that
25		was not ideal, not good.

1 Q. Did you become aware at a later time in that day, during 2 the day, that there had not been recovery of the clothing and equipment in relation to the officers? 3 4 Α. I think when I fully became aware that it hadn't been 5 done I think was possibly at the beginning of the forensic strategy meeting. It may have -- that is my 6 7 recollection and then that is when Garry was re-directed to -- once we concluded that, to bring that -- oversee 8 9 that process, and the additional instruction in relation 10 to the PAVA spray canisters as well. At that point, either during or after the forensic 11 Q. 12 strategy meeting, what was your expectation in terms of 13 recovery at that time? If the recovery had commenced, that it was completed 14 Α. 15 fully overseen by the PIRC staff. 16 Were you aware at that time that there was an allegation Q. 17 that the female police officer, Nicole Short, one of 18 the officers who was at the scene, had been injured? 19 Yes, because I had requested that an apparent injury was Α. 20 photographed, I think that was during that meeting as 21 well. 22 Was that the forensic strategy meeting? Q. 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. Now, the briefing note that we will come to that you had 25 prepared that day makes the comment that one of

1		the female officers was apparently kicked in the back
2		and also sustained a blow to the back of the head?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	You asked for the injuries to be photographed, but in
5		respect of the head injury. I am wondering was there
6		were you taking a view that there were no injuries
7		because of a kick to the back, or?
8	Α.	No, I think there is reference as well to medical
9		examinations of the officers, I think.
10	Q.	Yes, we have heard evidence about that.
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	So what were you looking for in terms of preserving
13		evidence, and asking for photographs?
14	Α.	It was to photograph the apparent injuries at that time
15		and then that would probably be done again if it was the
16		likes of a bruising or anything that
17	Q.	We have heard evidence that
18	Α.	came in as a result
19	Q.	bruising can develop over a period of time?
20	Α.	Yes, so it would be a period later to be specified
21		and when that would be done again to capture that as
22		well.
23	Q.	So was it part of your instruction only to take
24		photographs of head injuries or was it just to take
25		photographs of any injuries?

1	Α.	Injuries.
2	Q.	Any injuries?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	Not restricted to head?
5	A.	I don't think so.
6	Q.	Was any discussion did you get involved in any
7		discussion at the forensic strategy meeting about
8		recovery of the vest that Nicole Short was wearing, the
9		police vest?
10	A.	I don't think that specifically but obviously everything
11		was being recovered including that, was my
12	Q.	Was there any discussion at that time about doing any
13		sort of forensic comparison between the vest and the
14		footwear of Mr Bayoh?
15	Α.	Not at that time, no.
16	Q.	If there had been any marks on the vest that you were
17		aware of, would you have been instructing comparisons to
18		be carried out?
19	Α.	Not at that time. But it would be done, yes,
20		definitely.
21	Q.	I think in your Inquiry statement you say that you did
22		not have any contact with the police officers in the
23		canteen that day?
24	Α.	That's correct.
25	Q.	As part of your role as lead investigator would you have

1		expected to have contact with the officers?
2	A.	No, not then. But now very much so, yes.
3	Q.	Tell us what you do now?
4	A.	Again, as far as part of the post-incident process
5		that certainly if I was involved in that, which I have
6		been on a few occasions, after introduction to the
7		post-incident manager we would or I would get an
8		introduction to the officers or police staff, I would
9		identify who I am, outline the role of the PIRC, if they
10		were unaware of it, and make them aware of their status
11		at that particular time.
12	Q.	Did anyone from PIRC go to the canteen to speak with any
13		of the officers?
14	Α.	No.
15	Q.	On reflection, now obviously the practice has changed,
16		do you think there's advantages to the change in that
17		practice which you didn't have in 2015?
18	Α.	Very much so, yes.
19	Q.	Tell us
20	Α.	A huge improvement.
21	Q.	Huge. Tell us why you consider that a huge improvement?
22	Α.	Because it is all about communication. I think we maybe
23		don't have proper consideration, somebody that has never
24		been involved with our organisation before, there are
25		still officers that have very little awareness of what

1	we do, the types of investigations we do, why we do
2	them, and what the outcome of these are, so it is really
3	a good practice to do that introduction, make them aware
4	of what their personal situation is and the fact there
5	is going to be a wider investigation. If I had done
6	that on the day~ I probably maybe now I wish I did,
7	but~
8	LORD BRACADALE: Can you explain to me why you didn't do
9	that?
10	A. At that time, sir, most or in fact all of the
11	communications with officers in relation to our
12	investigations were done through police senior managers,
13	that was the practice at that time. But, as I say, that
14	has change wholesale now.
15	LORD BRACADALE: But what was the rationale for that? I am
16	trying to understand why that was done.
17	A. I don't think I can give you a full answer to that.
18	That was that was the way it was done at the time.
19	And as I say, even in relation to requests for witness
20	statements, that was done through senior management as
21	well. But the difference was, with the post-incident
22	processes, it was different in relation to the firearms.
23	LORD BRACADALE: Apart from that practice, was there
24	anything to prevent you going into the canteen, telling
25	them who you were, telling them you are in charge, and

1		taking it from there?
2	A.	No, I offered to do it but I then I didn't pursue
3		that later, and maybe on reflection that could have been
4		done.
5	LOR	D BRACADALE: Perhaps Ms Grahame could take that on as to
6		whom you offered that to and so forth.
7	MS	GRAHAME: In terms of you've said you offered to speak
8		to the officers.
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	Do you remember when that was?
11	A.	Yes, it was after I think it was the back of
12		3 o'clock, after Pat Campbell had come back to me and
13		said that the officers, on legal advice from the that
14		had come through the Federation, that they weren't going
15		to provide statements at that stage. I said I would go
16		and speak to them, clarify their status and see if that
17		made any difference.
18	Q.	So that would be after the second Gold Group meeting,
19		the one you attended at 2.40?
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	What was Pat Campbell's response to that suggestion by
22		you?
23	A.	I can't remember a verbal response but I took it at that
24		point that he was taking that away to offer that up,
25		whether it be through the Federation representative or

1		otherwise.
2	Q.	What was the response ultimately that you received in
3		relation to that suggestion?
4	Α.	No response.
5	Q.	Did you follow that up
6	A.	No, I didn't. And as I say, in hindsight that is
7		possibly something I could have done.
8	Q.	Looking at it now, do you consider that perhaps going
9		through and making requests through Police Scotland
10		perhaps looks slightly deferential to Police Scotland
11		when you are supposed to be in charge and taking the
12		lead on matters?
13	Α.	Possibly.
14	Q.	If you had taken the initiative and gone, when would you
15		have gone to speak to the officers?
16	Α.	As soon as somebody came back to me and said, "Yes, that
17		is fine".
18	Q.	So if Pat Campbell had come back to you and said yes or
19		no, what would you have done?
20	Α.	If he had?
21	Q.	If he had come back to you and said, "Yes, go and see
22		the officers", or, "No, we don't want you"
23	Α.	I would have done that.
24	Q.	If he had said yes. What if he had said, "No we don't
25		want you to do that"?

1	Α.	I don't know actually, I am not sure. I think I would
2		have to be in that position to actually \dots I would
3		probably have questioned him further on how do you get
4		that response in the first place and then make
5		a decision from there.
6	Q.	We have heard evidence and you have just mentioned that
7		officers were refusing to provide, or were not prepared
8		to give statements?
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	Was it Pat Campbell that told you it was on the basis of
11		legal advice
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	that they had received? Was that linked to advice
14		that they had apparently received from the Federation,
15		or
16	A.	A representative.
17	Q.	From a representative. Can I confirm, you mentioned
18		this earlier, was the status of the officers at that
19		time, did it remain witnesses
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	as a witness?
22	A.	It didn't change.
23	Q.	We have heard evidence from Amanda Givan, who was the
24		Federation rep on that day, and she has said that the
25		officers absolutely didn't have clarification of status.

1 She said she was absolutely certain that during the day they didn't have clarification of their status. Can you 2 3 explain why that was, if that is correct? 4 No, I can't because it was quite clear, it was raised Α. 5 with Pat Campbell, I know Pat Campbell referred to that, that his position was that they were witnesses 6 7 throughout as well. I mentioned in the Gold Group meeting that we would be -- that they were all witnesses 8 and we would be requiring statements from them in due 9 10 course. So when was the first time that you remember saying to 11 Q. 12 Pat Campbell, for example, that the officers' status was 13 of witness? I think it was either on the first or second telephone 14 Α. 15 conversation with him before we got to Kirkcaldy. 16 During the course of that day, how many times did you Q. speak to Pat Campbell about the status of the officers? 17 18 Α. One for definite and the second occasion would be during 19 the Gold Group meeting, he was there along with ACC Nicholson and the other Police Scotland staff. 20 21 I think in your statement you say you thought Trickett Q. 22 was maybe present at a Gold Group meeting? Yes, I understand he maybe wasn't there but I thought he 23 Α. 24 was. 25 Q. We heard evidence from Conrad Trickett that he didn't go

1		to the Gold Group meetings that day, that there had been
2		a conversation between him and Garry McEwan that he was
3		better to spend time with the officers instead of
4		attending the Gold Group meetings. Looking back now, do
5		you think that the level of communication between
6		yourself and Police Scotland about the status of the
7		officers could have been improved?
8	Α.	No, it was very clear.
9	Q.	Was there any we have also heard evidence about some
10		of the officers may have wanted their status confirmed
11		in writing. Was there any reason why PIRC would have
12		been reluctant to put that status in writing?
13	Α.	I wasn't aware of any such request.
14	Q.	If you had been asked on 3 May to put that in writing,
15		what would your response have been to that sort of
16		request?
17	Α.	That probably would have initiated going to speak to the
18		officers direct again and giving that one-to-one or
19		one-to-the-group clarification at all, if you need it.
20		As I say, it had been conveyed through Police Scotland
21		but the response was that on the legal advice that
22		they had, that so that was my assessment was that
23		that wasn't going to change in the short-term. But
24		there was never any indication to me that they were
25		unaware of what their status was.

1	Q.	When you heard that they weren't willing to give
2		statements, at that point did you consider speaking to
3		them direct, the officers
4	A.	Well, that was the point when I was made aware with
5		Pat Campbell and that offer was made, that as I say,
6		in hindsight I could have potentially followed that up
7		more strongly.
8	Q.	Can we perhaps look at the Gold Group meeting minutes
9		for that meeting. PS07268. You will see the time is
10		given as 14.40, you are present at that time,
11		Keith Harrower, and also John Ferguson who I understand
12		was an investigator for PIRC as well?
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	Just shortly prior to this meeting you have arrived in
15		Kirkcaldy Police Office and you have had a handover with
16		Pat Campbell?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	Who else was at the handover? We have heard evidence
19		I think that Lesley Boal was there; do you remember her?
20	A.	I am sure there was more of our staff, I don't know if
21		they were all there or not.
22	Q.	You think all of the PIRC staff were
23	A.	I am not sure if they were all there, but there was
24		certainly other PIRC staff there.
25	Q.	Right. That was the first face-to-face discussion that

1		you had had with Pat Campbell, the SIO?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	Can you tell us the version that you were given of
4		events at that handover? Now, you may want to look at
5		your operational notes, I think page 8.
6	A.	What time was that again?
7	Q.	This would be around about half past one.
8	A.	There is no notes regarding that specifically, the notes
9		are in relation to the following the Gold Group
10		meeting just after 2 o'clock.
11	Q.	Was there any difference between the version you were
12		given at the handover compared to what you had been told
13		by Green, Blackhall and Campbell?
14	A.	Not from my recollection. It pretty much mirrored our
15		second discussion with Pat Campbell and then I think
16		more about what was going on elsewhere at the other
17		locations.
18	Q.	You have said in your statement you were satisfied in
19		relation to the handover yourself. We have heard
20		evidence from Pat Campbell and Lesley Boal about the
21		handover, and Lesley Boal I will just read this out.
22		She gave evidence on 66th day of the Inquiry on
23		1 September last year and said:
24		"For me it wasn't at a sufficient level."
25	A.	She described it as:

"There were a couple of, if I can call it, 1 2 tumbleweed moments. To be honest it was quite uncomfortable." 3 4 She says: 5 "I suppose I thought, perhaps wrongly, that PIRC would come in and, you know, there would be a discussion 6 7 as to what they wanted, because my impression was that they were going to lead the investigation and 8 9 Police Scotland were there to provide any support that 10 they so required. I highlighted the fact that there may be other specialists available to start drawing up 11 12 strategies for other areas and my thought was, well, 13 Police Scotland could draw up a strategy, hand it to PIRC, they could either accept it, amend it or reject 14 15 it, it was up to them, and I thought that would be helpful." 16 17 She said: 18 "There wasn't obvious information coming from the meeting." 19 20 Do you have any comments about what Lesley Boal said 21 to the Inquiry about the handover not being at a sufficient level? 22 A. That is clearly her opinion. I don't think Pat Campbell 23 articulated along similar lines, as far as I was aware. 24 I was satisfied from the information we got and then 25

1		subsequently from the Gold Group meeting to then move
2		forward to do the priority actions that we had to do.
3	Q.	So you were satisfied with the quality of the that
4		meeting, that handover, between Police Scotland and PIRC
5		at that time?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	Can I ask you about let's go back to the
8		Gold Group minutes which we have on the screen. You
9		will see as we go through that perhaps we could look
10		at page 2. Thank you. You are given a factual update.
11		Pat Campbell talks to the investigative process and
12		details various items that are included. If we can go
13		to the bottom of that page it says:
14		"FLO to be briefed in relation to equality and
15		diversity, NOK has been informed by DC Parker and
16		DC Mitchell."
17		Just above that there is next of kin strategy:
18		"Partner of deceased made aware and statement noted,
19		no formal ID has taken place but ID has been done by
20		a Facebook image initially. [Next of kin] identified as
21		sister and a FLO being identified (2 x Police Scotland
22		FLOs have been identified 1 x DI as FLO to brief and
23		coordinate."
24		Can you tell me what your expectations were at that
25		time in relation to FLOs?

1 Α. It had been discussed at an early stage with 2 Pat Campbell prior to arriving that the Police Scotland 3 FLOs were going to be deployed. There was no question 4 over that at that stage, and obviously that hadn't 5 changed at that time. That was part of the plan, and I was satisfied with that. I knew that at some stage, 6 7 an early stage, our FLOs would be deployed but not that day. Then they would have an appropriate time to be 8 9 briefed for a handover for the family at the appropriate 10 stage. Can you explain why there were no FLOs from PIRC 11 Q. 12 available that day? Available as in ...? 13 Α. 14 You have said there were no FLOs -- we have heard Q. 15 evidence there were no PIRC FLOs that day. 16 No, there were none there and there were none -- well, Α. 17 there was one that was on call who -- John Ferguson was a FLO as well but obviously he was otherwise engaged. 18 So we didn't pursue trying to get any trained FLOs at 19 20 that stage as we had a commitment from Police Scotland 21 that FLOs would be deployed. 22 So your understanding was that Police Scotland were Q. deploying FLOs? 23 24 Α. Yes. 25 Q. For use that day?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	And although John Ferguson was a trained FLO
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	he was engaged with other tasks?
5	A.	Yes, he was going to be dealing with Mr Bayoh's body.
6	Q.	If you had had extra resources or another pair of hands
7		would that have freed up John Ferguson and released him
8		to allow him to perform FLO tasks?
9	A.	It could have done, yes.
10	Q.	So if you had had extra PIRC staff investigators, could
11		you have found PIRC FLOs that day?
12	Α.	I may have been able to made attempts anyway to call
13		them out in addition to that. As I say, I was satisfied
14		with the arrangements that were in place at that time.
15	Q.	So you were satisfied that this would be FLOs would
16		be provided by Police Scotland?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	And did it matter at all that PIRC were responsible for
19		the investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh or you were
20		happy that Police Scotland should be dealing with the
21		matter and FLOs?
22	Α.	At the initial stage, but that would change. That
23		happens a lot where we have critical incidents where
24		particularly at that time, where Police Scotland would
25		deploy FLOs initially for a variety of reasons and that

1		speedily turned around depending on where the location
2		is, etc and then they would have a comprehensive
3		handover with our staff to the family who would then
4		continue to the end of the investigation.
5	Q.	We have heard some evidence about FLOs and I hope to be
6		able to we will be hearing more evidence later in the
7		Inquiry. Is it the case that, when you have a FLO, that
8		it is an important aspect to build relationships and
9		good relationships with the next of kin
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	with the family. Is that not easier if it is the
12		same person that is continuing to maintain that contact
13		with the family, rather than chopping and changing?
14	A.	It could be in a lot of circumstances, yes.
15	Q.	Would there have been benefits in appointing PIRC FLOs
16		that day and maintaining that contact between PIRC FLOs
17		and the family?
18	A.	There may have been, particularly when, in hindsight,
19		with how things went with Police Scotland and the
20		response by the family.
21	Q.	Nowadays would you appoint PIRC FLOs sooner, so you have
22		that reassurance that you know who is going and who is
23		staying with the family?
24	A.	To be honest, Alistair will be better informed to give
25		you more information on that, but just now my

1		understanding is that it happens both ways still.
2		I have recently dealt with other deaths where initially
3		Police Scotland FLOs would be deployed and then, as
4		I say, we then hand over and there would be a variety of
5		reasons for that.
6	Q.	In terms of best practice, what is the best option for
7		the family: having the Police Scotland FLO initially and
8		then changing or having PIRC FLOs and staying?
9	A.	For some families that might work adequately well.
10		There is not an issue with that. Others, it would work
11		much better if there is a continuity, as you refer to,
12		throughout, I think. People would be very different.
13		They are carrying out the same function.
14	Q.	As lead investigator you obviously juggling resources
15		and making decisions about who is to go where. Is this
16		a situation where you prioritised John Ferguson for his
17		role in going to Victoria Hospital
18	Α.	He was called out specifically for his skill base as
19		a scene manager.
20	Q.	So you utilised him for scene management experience that
21		he had?
22	Α.	Yes, and Garry Sinclair likewise.
23	Q.	Garry Sinclair likewise?
24	A.	Yes, likewise.
25	Q.	Rather than any FLO experience that Mr Ferguson had?

1 Α. Yes. In hindsight now, looking at that decision, do you think 2 Q. 3 it would have been better to prioritise FLO over scene 4 management? At the time I was more than content with the 5 Α. 6 arrangements that were in place. As I say, it had 7 happened on numerous occasions, the same way in relation to the family liaison officers, so I was more than 8 9 content at the time that that -- but obviously the 10 circumstances changed very late in the day. Can I ask you about delivery of the death message. We 11 Q. 12 have heard a lot of evidence about that. That was 13 delivered by Police Scotland officers. We have heard 14 from both of them. Looking to the future, obviously 15 I am interested in whether you think PIRC could take a more proactive role in relation to delivery of the 16 17 death message. So in a situation where PIRC are brought 18 in to investigate a death and there is going to be 19 liaison with the family, there is going to be contact 20 with the family, perhaps for a sustained period, do you 21 think there would be any benefit in having PIRC take 22 a more proactive role in relation to that? I think there would be a lot of issues with that. The 23 Α. death message -- I have heard significant discussion as 24 regards the delays to the family, quite rightly. It was 25

1 a lengthy period of time before they were made aware. 2 It is important that they are made aware at a very early 3 juncture. Now, to put that into the responsibility of 4 PIRC FLOs that may be travelling two or three hours to 5 get to a location, I think it is impractical. As far as we are concerned it's a police responsibility to deliver 6 7 that death message, deliver it in an appropriate manner with relevant information on what can be said at the 8 time. I think that was the issue here. 9 10 Q. When you say -- Police Scotland responsibility at a very 11 earlier juncture the death message should be delivered? 12 Α. Yes. When you say that, "a very early juncture", what time 13 Q. 14 scale are you considering to be appropriate? 15 Α. As soon as reasonably practical. In different circumstances, again that depends where the family 16 17 members are. There could be travel involved to do that 18 personally. Obviously, it has to be done in person or 19 should be, so -- but it has to be there as a high 20 priority to have that action completed. 21 When did you become aware that -- obviously we can see Q. 22 in the minutes of this Gold Group meeting that you are told next of kin has been informed by DC Parker and 23 DC Mitchell. We have heard evidence this actually 24 25 wasn't until shortly after 3 o'clock that they arrived

1 at the home of the Johnsons. When did you become aware 2 for the first time that the death message had been 3 delivered to the family? Was it at this meeting or was 4 it earlier or later? 5 I'm not sure. I was aware it hadn't been passed I think Α. 6 when I arrived at Kirkcaldy. As far as specifically 7 when I was told that it had been -- because I know it was initially under consideration that the FLOs would 8 deliver the death message. Now, I'm sure that was --9 10 Q. We have heard people speak of that. 11 Yes, but that to my mind was inappropriate as well. So Α. 12 that was I think quickly turned around to whatever the 13 decision process was about who actually delivered that and what was said. 14 15 Q. Prior to this Gold Group meeting who was it that told you the death message hadn't been delivered? 16 I am not 100% sure. I would anticipate it came from 17 Α. 18 Pat Campbell, because the majority of the information on 19 the ongoing issues were coming through him, but I don't 20 know that for sure. 21 Q. Did that cause you concern from a PIRC perspective, that 22 the family hadn't been --23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. -- up until then? 25 Α. Yes.

1	Q.	What were those concerns? What was the basis for those
2		concerns?
3	A.	It is the right for the family to know, that they should
4		be made aware that of losing a close relative and
5		it's only right and proper that that is delivered at
6		an early juncture.
7	Q.	Then we see on the next page at item 5 on the agenda of
8		this meeting there's discussion there of:
9		"Family concerns - (Det Insp Robson)
10		"Discussion [regarding] [next of kin] strategy
11		identified as sister of deceased, Collette Bell,
12		girlfriend of deceased is currently within Kirkcaldy
13		Police Station and has been informed a deceased person
14		is in hospital and that it may be her partner."
15		Do you remember discussion at that time about family
16		concerns?
17	A.	No, I don't recall. Obviously it has taken place but
18		I don't recall any specifications on that.
19	Q.	Then for completeness item 8 on the agenda is headed
20		up "Staff welfare". This name next to it is
21		Chief Inspector Trickett. As I said earlier, we have
22		heard from Conrad Trickett that he didn't attend the
23		Gold Group meetings that morning. You have mentioned
24		that you thought he was
25	Α.	I thought he was there, yes.

1	Q.	Do you remember this discussion about staff welfare and
2		who led on that discussion?
3	A.	All I can recall I can't remember if it was
4		Pat Campbell that told me what Chief Inspector
5		Trickett's function was there, which was welfare and
6		support of the officers. That was what was articulated
7		to me, but that is all I can remember.
8	Q.	It says there:
9		"Trickett and two Fed reps have been with officers
10		providing support and assistance throughout the day."
11		There is no mention there of post-incident
12		procedures having been implemented?
13	Α.	No.
14	Q.	Thank you. Can I ask you about we talked about it
15		earlier, the parallel investigation, the part of the
16		investigation that Police Scotland were conducting about
17		events leading up to the arrival of Mr Bayoh at
18		Hayfield Road. Were you kept up-to-date on that aspect
19		of the police investigation?
20	A.	Yes. Pat Campbell gave me updates at different
21		intervals on I think developments with the houses, etc.
22	Q.	And did the Gold Group meetings cover both those
23		elements
24	A.	Yes, I believe so.
25	Q.	the police aspect of the investigation and the PIRC

1		aspect?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	Looking back now, did that help or did it hinder?
4		Did it cause confusion or was it of assistance?
5	A.	I don't think it caused confusion. As I said, it was
6		helpful from my perspective just to know what was going
7		on in relation to the other incidents, and any
8		significant developments from there.
9	Q.	Can I be clear, PIRC had at that time no responsibility
10		at all in relation to the matters leading up to the
11		arrival of Mr Bayoh in Hayfield Road?
12	Α.	No.
13	Q.	So we have heard evidence from a number of witnesses
14		about searches of properties or seizing properties,
15		police arriving at properties, in relation to
16		Collette Bell, Martyn Dick, Kirsty MacLeod and
17		Mr Saeed's family home, a number of his relatives. Were
18		PIRC involved with any of that?
19	A.	No.
20	Q.	Were you responsible for any decisions taken in relation
21		to that?
22	A.	No.
23	Q.	Were you aware of the legal basis upon which it was
24		intended to seize or search any of those properties?
25	A.	I think there was certainly reference at some point to

1 seeking permission of the respective householders to undertake that activity. I am sure that was mentioned 2 at some stage during the forensic strategy meeting 3 4 I think, although I don't think it was recorded within 5 the minutes or anything for that, but ... Q. For example, we have heard evidence from a Mrs Rashid 6 7 and a Mr Ahmed and we have seen the scene entry log of the police arriving at their home at round about 1.30 in 8 9 the afternoon. My understanding is that that would have 10 been prior to the forensic strategy meeting, is that correct? 11 12 A. It would have been, yes. Q. Who was it that discussed permission of householders at 13 the forensic strategy meeting? 14 15 A. I don't know who raised the topic. I just have recollection of it being mentioned at some point and 16 17 I thought it related to that meeting. As I say, there was no direct discussion on how that would be 18 19 approached, what our viewpoint was on it or -- because 20 it wasn't relevant to us. 21 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 22 I am about to move on to another topic. Would you wish me to continue? 23 LORD BRACADALE: I think, given the time, this would be 24 an appropriate moment to rise. So we will continue with 25

1	your evidence tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock,
2	Mr Harrower. Thank you. We are adjourned until
3	10 o'clock tomorrow morning.
4	(4.14 pm)
5	(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Wednesday,
6	7 February 2024)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- -

1	INDEX
2	PAGE
3	MR KEITH HARROWER (called)1
4	MR KEITH HARROWER (sworn)2
5	Questions from MS GRAHAME2
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	