1	Wednesday, 7 February 2024
2	(10.00 am)
3	MR KEITH HARROWER (continued)
4	Questions from MS GRAHAME (continued)
5	LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Mr Harrower.
6	Ms Grahame.
7	MS GRAHAME: Thank you.
8	Good morning, Mr Harrower. I would like to ask you
9	some questions continuing with the issue of family
10	liaison. Could we look at your first Inquiry statement,
11	please. SBPI 00259. If we can look at paragraph 36.
12	I am interested in looking at who was responsible for
13	deploying the FLOs. So we see here that this is your
14	Inquiry statement and you say:
15	"In a PIRC investigation, there would be a firm
16	expectation that Police Scotland family liaison officers
17	were deployed. Then, if there was a need for PIRC FLOs
18	to be deployed, then that would potentially be a day or
19	two after. I can't be more specific than that because
20	it'll depend on the circumstances and a lot of
21	communication and dialogue would need to take place
22	between the PIRC-appointed FLOs and the Police Scotland
23	FLOs, but a definite expectation that the
24	Police Scotland FLOs would be deployed first. To
25	a great extent, that's still the case in relation to

FLOs. There will be a period where Police Scotland will 1 initiate that process, and then there will be a formal 2 3 communication and handover with the family for our FLOs to have to take on that role." 4 Do you see that? So you seem to be saying here in 5 your Inquiry statement that there was a firm 6 7 expectation, a definite expectation, on the part of PIRC, on the part of you, that the Police Scotland FLOs 8 9 would be deployed initially? 10 Α. At that time, yes. That has changed slightly but it still occurs that Police Scotland FLOs are deployed at 11 12 the outset of a critical incident, not all the time but 13 it does still happen regularly. Can you explain to what extent it has changed? 14 Q. 15 There will be on occasions -- depending on the Α. circumstances and geographically where the incident is, 16 17 I am aware that FLOs from the PIRC side have been deployed from the outset, but I don't know on how many 18 occasions that has been. But certainly at that time 19 20 that was the normal process, that the Police Scotland 21 FLOs would be deployed initially, and then subsequently there would be a decision made whether PIRC FLOs were 22 required and they would then get a detailed briefing and 23 handover from Police Scotland formally to the family to 24 25 then take on that role for the full extent of the

- 1 investigation.
- 2 Q. When did the position change in relation to sometimes
- 3 PIRC FLOs go in first?
- A. I couldn't give you a definitive date on that. I'm not
- 5 sure, I am quite sure Alistair Lewis would be able to
- 6 confirm that as the PIRC co-ordinator.
- 7 Q. We will ask Mr Lewis. You have obviously experienced
- 8 both options, the PIRC FLOs going in now, maybe first,
- 9 and in 2015 it was the Police Scotland FLOs --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- who would go. Can you in your experience see any
- 12 advantages or disadvantages of PIRC FLOs going in first?
- 13 A. Again, it depend on their availability. On some
- 14 occasions FLOs would not be deployed on the first day of
- an incident at all. Again, depending on where that is,
- if it's seen there's a need for FLOs, immediately, then
- obviously it would have to be weighed up where they
- 18 would deploy to, what the family position was, and you
- 19 know the time considerations in relation to that.
- Q. Assuming a PIRC FLO was available now, they are
- 21 geographically available and in a suitable location, and
- 22 the family position is, for whatever reason, amenable to
- 23 a PIRC FLO being in attendance --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- in regard to that set of circumstances are there any

1 advantages of sending the PIRC FLOs in first, 2 straightaway? Arguably I would think from continuity, right from the 3 Α. beginning as far as -- I think we touched on that

4

- 5 briefly yesterday, as regards the family being
- introduced to the -- some level of trust and good 6 7 communication being built up, to maintain that.
- Can you see any disadvantages in the PIRC FLOs going in 8 Q. 9 first in the circumstances --
- 10 Α. A major part of FLO deployment prior to that is them 11 having a full awareness of that stage of the 12 investigation at that time, even if it is an early 13 stage. That is why the handover to individuals, it's 14 very significant that that is not done too quickly 15 because they are obviously the conduit with the family and the investigation itself, and there is a requirement 16 17 for them to be confident in the information that they 18 have and that they are kept up-to-date with the investigation and communicate relevant information to 19 the family representatives. 20
- 21 Q. So the quality of that handover or the timing --
- 22 Is very important, yes. Α.
- Q. -- could be a possible disadvantage? 23
- So it's not only getting FLOs out and deployed, it is 24 Α. 25 then having the capability for them to be appropriately

1		briefed. That is probably why the Police Scotland FLOs
2		quite regularly, particularly at that time, were
3		deployed initially, they had the availability, the
4		expertise to be briefed and deployed as soon as
5		practical.
6	Q.	So sending out PIRC FLOs at an early stage could be
7		a disadvantage depending on a number of factors,
8		including the quality of the handover, the briefing they
9		have, the information that is available to them?
10	Α.	Yes, you would hope that collectively there would be
11		sufficient information to administer that briefing
12		depending on the availability of individuals. Obviously
13		on the day the Police Scotland FLOs were there, and
14		I understand that that update to them and briefing had
15		taken place at some late stage in the afternoon.
16	Q.	Thank you. Can we look now please at SBPI 00258, which
17		is an Inquiry statement from Garry McEwan. If we could
18		look at paragraph 86. Here Garry McEwan has said he
19		is talking about the FLOs and he is talking about
20		the background to this, he said it is important:
21		" because by the time I got involved with the
22		family directly"
23		We have heard evidence, and we discussed this
24		yesterday, that Garry McEwan had visited the family on
25		3 May.

1 A. Yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"... by the time I got involved with the family directly 2 Q. 3 there was already a great deal of anger and upset. PIRC 4 were responsible for family liaison. My point of 5 contention in this case is that they weren't dealing with it properly. I felt like I needed to see the 6 7 family because it wasn't at the forefront of PIRC's mind. On the day in question they didn't have the FLOs 8 9 out, they weren't even on duty. That wasn't good 10 enough. I raised that a couple of times directly with PIRC. Their recommendation was 'it is fine we'll see 11 12 them tomorrow'. I disagreed. I said we can't leave the 13 family overnight. They needed to be briefed and made 14 aware. It was wholly inappropriate."

So in this paragraph, as you see from Garry McEwan's statement, he seems to be of the view that PIRC were responsible for family liaison. I'm wondering if you can help the Chair and perhaps shed some light on this apparent mismatch between your view that Police Scotland were responsible and Garry McEwan's view that PIRC were responsible for deploying the FLOs.

A. It was clear at that time that Police Scotland had taken on that responsibility and that was from the early discussions I had with Pat Campbell, he confirmed that that process was ongoing, that the FLOs had been

- 1 contacted and were en route at that time, and then
- 2 subsequently arrived at Kirkcaldy Police Station. As
- I mentioned just a short time ago, I think they had got
- 4 as far as being briefed in relation to the incident.
- 5 Q. So the early discussions that you had had with
- 6 Pat Campbell had led you to believe that Police Scotland
- 7 had accepted the responsibility to deploy FLOs?
- 8 A. Very much so, and that was confirmed at the Gold Group
- 9 meeting as well and that is referred to I think in the
- 10 discussions that were had, that, you know, that was
- ongoing, and that these -- the FLOs had been identified,
- who these officers were.
- Q. We looked at the minutes yesterday, I think.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. I wonder if you would help me with the guidance that was
- available at that time, to assist the Chair understand
- 17 what was available to Police Scotland and PIRC. Can
- we look at the position of Police Scotland first of all.
- 19 I understand there may be two SOPs that may be
- 20 applicable to this type of situation, and I think the
- 21 simplest way of showing this is by looking at
- 22 a statement by Kevin Houliston. Do you know the name
- 23 Kevin Houliston?
- 24 A. Yes, I know Kevin Houliston.
- Q. I think he was a FLO.

1 Α. Yes, he was. He was one of the two FLOs. Q. Let's look at SBPI 00354. This is an Inquiry statement 2 3 that Mr Houliston has provided to the Inquiry and I would like to look at two paragraphs, 47, and 49. 4 5 Hopefully we can see both of them on the screen. 47 6 says: 7 "I am now referred to the Police Scotland Death or Serious Injury in Police Custody Standard Operating 8 Procedure 2013 ... at paragraph 5.8 ..." 9 10 This is set out, the terms of that paragraph are set 11 out: 12 "The PIRC may elect to deploy their own FLOs, 13 however it may be that, for logistical reasons, a police 14 FLO will require to be deployed in the initial stages. 15 Discussions and careful negotiations will take place between the PIRC Senior Investigator and the SIO; 16 17 ideally an independent FLO will be deployed." So that seems to be a SOP, a Police Scotland SOP, 18 19 from 2013. I don't know if you have ever seen that 20 before? 21 Α. I don't recall having read it, no. Then if we can look at paragraph 49, there's another SOP 22 Q. referred to here, Police Scotland Family Liaison SOP. 23 This is from the next year, 2014, and the reference is 24 to paragraph 6.1.2: 25

"Where COPFS has directed an independent 1 investigation in the case of ... Deaths in police 2 custody ... fully trained independent Family Liaison 3 4 Officers will be deployed by the Senior Investigator of 5 the Police Investigation and Review Commission." So on this occasion in this SOP it seems to be 6 7 saying that for an investigation where PIRC are appointed to look into a death in police custody, which 8 9 is the scenario that you were in on 3 May, that FLOs 10 will be deployed by the senior investigator of PIRC. 11 Have you ever come across this SOP in your 12 dealings --No, I don't recall. Really I don't. 13 Α. Let's now look at the position of PIRC in terms of the 14 Q. 15 guidance. Can we look at PIRC 03885. This is a document, a PIRC document, in relation to family 16 17 liaison and we will get that up on the screen. You will see that it's headed up, "Family liaison officer", 18 19 and we can see that the author is Alistair Lewis, who 20 I believe is a FLO, we are hoping to hear from him later 21 in the Inquiry, and you will see that the date published 22 is 24 June 2015. So this is the month after the events at Hayfield Road on 3 May. 23 24 Α. Yes. 25 Q. We haven't heard from Alistair Lewis in evidence yet,

```
but my understanding is that he will say there was
 1
 2
             an earlier version of this document, this document is
 3
             the closest the Inquiry has to that earlier version, and
             I understand he will give evidence that there's
 4
             consistency there.
 5
                 Can we look at page 2, please. This relates to the
 6
 7
             deployment -- sorry, we have just passed it. Thank you:
                 "Deployment of a PIRC FLO."
 8
 9
                 And it says here:
                 "The PIRC will normally deploy a FLO in
10
             circumstances where there has been a death following
11
12
             police contact and where there is an identifiable
             family."
13
14
                 It goes on to say:
15
                 "The PIRC may also deploy a FLO in other
             circumstances~..."
16
17
                 So there's three versions of SOPs effectively here,
             there's the two police SOPs and the PIRC document, and
18
             the variations seem to be a PIRC FLO will be deployed,
19
20
             a PIRC FLO will normally be deployed or PIRC may elect
21
             to deploy a FLO or may not, in which case
             Police Scotland will be required to deploy a FLO. They
22
23
             all seem to have slight variations in terms of the
24
             guidance that is being given --
25
         Α.
             Yes.
```

Q. -- to PIRC and to the Police Service. From my reading of these, and hopefully Mr Lewis will give us more information about this, none of these documents spell out the position if FLOs are simply not available and none of them are entirely aligned with the guidance given to the other organisations. There is no specific quidance covering a situation where Police Scotland elect not to deploy FLOs, as you have been talking about at the Gold Group meeting.

Looking at all of this now in the cold light of day, do you think that this may have contributed to some confusion in the parts of police and PIRC in relation to what should have been happening with the FLOs?

- A. I think on the day certainly there was no confusion from either our side or Police Scotland side on what was actually going to happen in relation to family liaison officers, until obviously that broke down at the later stages in the evening. So that was clear from outset that, you know, that decision was made that FLOs were being deployed and who they were at that stage. There would be a full intention from the PIRC side to deploy our FLOs probably at an early stage, but not that day. That was -- arrangements were put in place on the day.
- Q. So from your perspective it was agreed, it had been discussed and agreed Police Scotland FLOs would be

- deployed on 3 May, PIRC FLOs would come in at a later
- 2 stage?
- 3 A. Yes, my understanding -- there is no dispute over that,
- 4 that was clearly understood on both sides and was
- 5 happening because they subsequently did attend the
- 6 office ready to deploy.
- 7 Q. And then, as you say, that arrangement broke down?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And I think yesterday you explained that you first
- 10 became aware of that breaking down at the Gold Group
- 11 meeting?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Was it quarter past eight in the evening or in the
- 14 evening?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. That was the third Gold Group meeting. Can I ask you
- about the ability to secure the service of FLOs.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Can we look at your second statement, that is
- SBPI 00382. This is paragraph 65. You are asked here
- 21 to refer to your operational notes. Do you still have
- 22 the hard copy of those in your blue folder? You are
- asked to look at page 6 of those. This related to your
- 24 note of the Gold Group meeting at 14.05, this question
- 25 says, so it was the one in the afternoon, I think.

1 A. Yes. 2 Q. We looked at the minutes yesterday, they were timed 3 14.40. 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. It says: "FLOs deployment soon." 6 7 So this was in the afternoon of 3 May and you were noting in your operational notes: 8 9 "FLOs deployment soon. "Following the Gold Group meeting at 1405 hours~..." 10 11 You are then asked: 12 "... what was your understanding of Police Scotland's planned deployment of ... (FLOs)~..." 13 14 And you say here: 15 "At the conclusion of the Gold Group Meeting my clear understanding was that Police Scotland intended to 16 17 deploy FLOs imminently and that the family would be made aware of the death. The FLOs were later identified as 18 DC Kevin Houliston and Jane Bell. PIRC FLOs would not 19 20 have been deployed that day. They would have been 21 identified at the earliest the following day [that would be 4 May] with a view to a planned briefing and formal 22 handover of responsibility between the PIRC and 23 Police Scotland FLOs." 24 25 I think that is what you were describing earlier?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. "It was imperative that the Police Scotland FLOs were
- deployed as soon as practicable on 3 May ... to engage
- 4 with the family."
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. That was your clear understanding after that Gold Group
- 7 meeting?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. That was the first Gold Group meeting that you had
- 10 attended?
- 11 A. That is correct.
- 12 Q. And certainly from the note that you have made in your
- operational statement you were under the impression they
- were being deployed imminently.
- Can I just check, I asked you this yesterday, but
- when we look at your operational notes can you confirm
- 17 those were either prepared at the time of events
- happening or shortly after?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Does that apply to all of the notes?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Thank you. So did you -- after that Gold Group meeting
- 23 did you feel reassured that that matter was in hand and
- 24 arrangements --
- 25 A. Yes, certainly.

1	Q.	Was there any indication after that meeting that things
2		were changing or matters had moved on?
3	A.	Not to my knowledge. It was obviously clearly
4		a surprise when as I say, the first indication from
5		memory was at the next Gold Group meeting where it came
6		out of the blue.
7	Q.	Let's look at the minutes for the next Gold Group
8		meeting, please. This is PS03139. So this is
9		the minutes we looked at yesterday from a Gold Group
10		meeting at around quarter past eight in the evening, so
11		it's around six hours later. And if we look at page 2,
12		item 5 on the agenda is entitled, "Family concerns".
13		You will see here it says:
14		"Chief Superintendent McEwan discussed
15		brother-in-law in of deceased, he is part of
16		an independent advisory group and had advised the
17		initial attending Officers that he knew Mr McEwan and
18		requested that he attend and speak with him within
19		24 hours.
20		"Ch Sup and Ch Insp Shepherd attended at home
21		address of [next of kin], highly charged environment,
22		deceased's partner Collette and extended family within,

family concerned that early contact they had was

told anything about who contacted the Police and

purposely vague. They were unhappy they had not been

23

24

25

15

Ambulance. Ch Sup provided them with an understanding 1 2 of events. Ch Sup discussed the Role of the PIRC and 3 reassured them it would not be P Division officers investigating the incident." 4 5 We have heard evidence previously that P Division 6 was Fife Police? 7 Α. Yes. Q. It was a legacy force. And then: 8 9 "TASK - Family crave reassurance and are asking 10 about witnesses etc they do not wish anything publicised until they inform deceased Mother who is in London." 11 12 Who was it that spoke to item 5 on the agenda, do 13 you remember? 14 I am sure it was Mr McEwan. Α. 15 Q. Had you been made aware prior to this meeting that Chief Superintendent McEwan had visited with the family? 16 17 Were you aware of that before this meeting? Yes, I think I was because I know that during his 18 Α. evidence he has already said that we had a discussion. 19 20 I don't specifically remember the discussion but he 21 mentioned that I had suggested it might not be a good idea to go to the house and certainly in the 22 circumstances, not knowing exactly what the family's 23 request specifically was, that clearly from my 24 perspective it would be a lot better that the FLOs took 25

1		on that visit, initial discussion. But, as I say,
2		I don't know the specifics around his personal visit and
3		how strong the family were in wanting that to happen.
4	Q.	Why did you think it would be better for the FLOs to
5		have a discussion with the family?
6	Α.	Because they are fully trained to deal with these
7		situations. They would be aware of what information to
8		pass, what they are satisfied was appropriate in the
9		circumstances. Obviously during his visit I am aware
10		that there was additional information given regarding
11		the incident which was different from both the previous
12		visits that were made by other officers.
13	Q.	You are aware of that how; from evidence from the
14		Inquiry?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	Can we look at your first statement SBPI 00259, please.
17		Paragraph 45. Thank you. This is in connection with
18		the Gold Group meeting, chaired by ACC Nicholson and you
19		say:
20		"My statement notes that we were advised by Garry
21		McEwan that he had recently returned from visiting
22		Mr Bayoh's family. He explained that the family had
23		'significant concerns over information disclosed to them
24		by representatives of Police Scotland, resulting in
25		a perceived mistrust of local police'."

1 And there was a highly charged atmosphere and the family were not happy with disclosure of information by 2 3 the police. The family think that the relative was 4 murdered and they have distrust of local officers. 5 You were asked to comment on that. When was it you were made aware that the family had significant concerns 6 7 about and did not trust the local police? I'm sure that was in the feedback during the Gold Group 8 Α. 9 meeting. 10 Q. So you hadn't been told that prior to --I don't recall any conversation I had been made aware in 11 Α. 12 any detail before that. I don't discount it is a possibility but I certainly don't recall that. 13 Q. So at that Gold Group meeting was this the first time 14 15 became aware that the family did have significant concerns --16 17 A. Yes. Q. -- in relation to Police Scotland officers? Did that 18 19 change the view about the benefits of sending 20 Police Scotland FLOs to see the family? 21 Α. I think from what is recorded there, the distrust was in relation to local officers, the FLOs that had been 22 delegated I understand are not local officers, they had 23 come from I think other legacy force areas outwith 24 25 the Fife area altogether.

- Q. Did you see a distinction between the family's views of 1 local officers or Fife officers, Kirkcaldy officers, and 2 the FLOs, the Police Scotland FLOs from a different 3 4 area? 5 I am unaware of what their general understanding would Α. be of saying "local officers", whether, you know, that 6 7 meant they had a perception that it would be officers from Kirkcaldy or the Fife area that would be dealing 8 with that, and I could understand that. 9 10 Q. Certainly it says here: "... significant concerns over information disclosed 11 12 to them by representatives of Police Scotland, resulting 13 in a perceived mistrust of local police." 14 Did you see their concerns as being very much 15 targeted towards the local police? 16 Α. Yes. Rather than a wider view of Police Scotland officers? 17 Q. 18 Yes, it's mentioned on a couple of occasions during that Α. 19 update that it is focused apparently on local officers. So if the Police Scotland FLOs were from outwith the 20 Q.
- A. From the family perspective, I dare say they would
  mention where they came from, so they would try and
  negate any of that trust as regards -- you know, they

local area, did you -- what benefits did you consider

there would remain if they were deployed to the family?

21

22

1		would have an explanation of where they were from once
2		they heard the concerns of the family.
3	Q.	Did you have any sense, either before the Gold Group
4		meeting or at that Gold Group meeting, that your views
5		and the views of Police Scotland, the senior officers,
6		were now diverging in relation to the deployment of
7		Police Scotland FLOs?
8	Α.	They certainly were in relation to the deployment of the
9		FLOs. I don't know whose decision ultimately it was to
10		cancel that full arrangement but obviously that was
11		done.
12	Q.	Let's look for a moment back at the minutes that we
13		looked at, the third Gold Group minutes. PS03139. And
14		we will move on to page 3. We are looking at the top of
15		page 3. It says:
16		"[Chief Superintendent]"
17		That is Garry McEwan:
18		" discusses initial decision to have
19		Police Scotland FLOs but now handover to PIRC FLOs for
20		arrangement to gain entry to house of deceased
21		re collecting belongings for child. Discussion
22		re initial contact on phone from PIRC."
23		Can you tell us some of the background to this topic
24		of discussion? Was this the point was it
25		Garry McEwan that indicated the initial decision to have

1 Police Scotland FLOs deployed was now being changed? Yes, I mean I don't know where the understanding --2 Α. 3 there seemed to be a thread of understanding that, you 4 know, that PIRC FLOs as a result of the action that was 5 taken would then come out. That was never going to happen that evening. The kind of late hour was -- it 6 7 was wholly impractical for that to then occur. If it had been agreed that PIRC FLOs would come out 8 Q. 9 earlier in the day, would that have been possible? 10 Α. It may have been possible. We will maybe come back to that. But this is the point 11 Q. 12 where you heard that Police Scotland FLOs were no longer 13 going to be deployed? Yes. 14 Α. 15 In light of that did you take any steps to see whether Q. it was possible for a PIRC FLO or PIRC FLOs to be 16 deployed even though it was after 8.00 in the evening? 17 I think I said in my statement I certainly took stock of 18 Α. 19 the situation after that Gold Group meeting, thought 20 about the alternatives to do that, but as I say given 21 the time in the evening, even if I was able to get in

contact with someone immediately and then make

arrangements to come out, realistically it was -- it

could potentially be the early hours of the morning

which in the circumstances was -- I didn't think was

22

23

24

25

21

- appropriate at all. Even -- and that's what focused my
  mind on going to see the family with my colleague and
  trying take things forward, explain to them the
  situation and what was going to happen, details as
  regards potential plans for the post mortem because that
- Q. So was your decision to speak to the family, was that because there were no FLOs going to see the family?

was always moving closer to that point.

6

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 9 I would have probably done that late in the evening Α. 10 anyway, after the FLOs had deployed and spoken to the family, and then by way of introduction and explanation. 11 12 Certainly at that time there was limited knowledge with 13 the police on what our full functions were but 14 significantly so with members of the public, so it was 15 appropriate to let them know what our function was, give them some assurance as regards how that independent 16 17 Inquiry would be conducted, and that we were a separate 18 agency altogether from the Police Service.
  - Q. You say in your statement that when you found out about the Police Scotland FLOs no longer being deployed, you were extremely displeased about that?
  - A. Yes, very much so, because I mean this had been in place for some time, that whole day, and you know in the circumstances, particularly with the apparent misinformation that had been passed to them in the first

1		place, there was a need for somebody to act as that
2		point of liaison and have that training and knowledge
3		to to conduct the communications in a proper fashion.
4	Q.	Can we look at your second statement SBPI 00382,
5		paragraph 104. Again, you are being asked about the
6		situation at the time of that third Gold Group meeting.
7		You say, at the bottom:
8		"I understand that the sudden change and decision
9		not to deploy Police Scotland FLOs was made by
10		Chief Superintendent McEwan. I did not agree with this
11		position and I felt it was inappropriate to take this
12		decision at that juncture. I am sure that I expressed
13		my disagreement and frustration on the decision to
14		Chief Superintendent McEwan and others after the
15		Gold Group Meeting. However, I cannot be more specific
16		on how and to who. In my view this decision was very
17		detrimental to attempts to engage with Mr Bayoh's family
18		and led to further frustration on their part moving
19		forward."
20		I'm interested in the part where you say:
21		" this decision was very detrimental to attempts
22		to engage with Mr Bayoh's family~"
23		You said it led to further frustration. Were you
24		concerned about the possible detriment to Mr Bayoh's
25		family?

- A. Yes, of course I was, and obviously at that stage we

  were aware that the post mortem was going to take place

  the following day, so the FLOs would have a significant

  role in that process in explaining that process, and
- 5 making arrangements.
- Q. In terms of the -- you are obviously the lead
  investigator, you are conducting a PIRC investigation,
  from the perspective of that investigation what impact,
  if any, did this decision have on the investigation
  itself?
- 11 A. On the wider investigation?
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13 I think at the early stage I think the biggest impact Α. 14 would be on the family and the lack of flow of 15 information. Particularly there was a lot of things happening at that time, they were specifically dealing 16 17 with the grief and the circumstances of the death of Mr Bayoh and then would be having to make decisions to 18 19 meet the request as regards the next stages of the 20 investigation.
- Q. We have heard evidence that an investigation can benefit from that flow of information from families?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Which can often -- FLOs can be a conduit for that. Is that something you recognise as being a positive

1		benefit?
2	Α.	Yes, they are the conduit for that, they are there to
3		assist the family with advice and communication but also
4		to assist the investigation itself.
5	Q.	We've also heard evidence from Pat Campbell in relation
6		to this matter. He gave some explanation as to the
7		reasoning by Police Scotland's decision:
8		" the family were refusing to engage, they were
9		not wanting to speak to Police Scotland officers at that
10		time or any local officers. I think it was as well
11		was the fact~"
12		I am quoting from his evidence at the moment:
13		"The discussion with Ruaraidh Nicholson and myself,
14		Lesley Boal, Garry McEwan was around and
15		Keith Harrower obviously involved in that as well was
16		that are we going to gain anything further here or is it
17		just simply going to aggravate an already sensitive
18		matter by deploying now Police Scotland FLOs to the
19		family? So we were all in agreement with that. The
20		fact is we didn't think there was any benefit at that
21		stage of deploying Police Scotland FLOs because of the
22		situation we found ourselves in to move forwards. At
23		that stage it was Garry McEwan being deployed to the
24		family to try to basically explain a bit more about
25		the incident and after the Gold Group Keith Harrower and

- the direction at the time from the ACC around the fact
  that PIRC would deploy FLOs and Keith Harrower would
  make contact with the family."
- As far as you are aware, was the decision not to deploy FLOs actually made at the Gold Group meeting?
- A. My understanding it would have been made before that,

  but I wasn't party to that at that stage.
- Q. Did you feel during that Gold Group meeting that you
  were taking part in a discussion where it was being
  considered whether to deploy Police Scotland FLOs?
- 11 A. No, to my mind from my recollection that decision had
  12 already been made and that was -- the presentation of
  13 that update was at that stage. So I was taken unawares
  14 by that.
- Q. So your impression was that it was not a discussion with -- that the outcome had been predetermined?
- 17 A. No, and that there wasn't an overall agreement on that
  18 because I didn't agree with that.
- Q. Did you make it clear at that meeting you didn't agree with that?
- A. After it, I think not -- I can't remember what input or
  dialogue I had during the meeting. Because I was
  obviously taken aback at that stage of what had actually
  occurred.
- 25 Q. And because you felt taken aback you didn't make your

1 own views clear? I can't -- I can't recall specifically what I said in 2 Α. 3 the confines of the meeting itself. We have also heard from Garry McEwan in relation to 4 Q. this. He had written in a statement that he was 5 informed after this Gold Group meeting that you had no 6 7 staff available to attended the house but you personally would telephone the family. But I think you've said 8 9 already you actually went to visit the family? 10 Α. Yes, I think I had possibly two phone calls initially to make that introduction and to see when it would be 11 12 suitable to go and visit them that evening. And 13 an arrangement was subsequently made. 14 Were there any steps taken by you that evening to see Q. 15 whether you could muster some PIRC FLOs --16 Α. No. -- to visit the family? 17 Q. 18 Α. No, given the hour in the day that I didn't see any 19 practical advantage to anyone in the circumstances 20 to ... 21 Q. Did you agree with Garry McEwan's comments which I read 22 out to you earlier, they were on the screen, that waiting 24 hours before a family are given a thorough 23 24 proper update on the circumstances, do you agree that is inappropriate to delay? 25

- 1 A. In relation to the -- is this in relation to the FLOs?
- 2 Q. The FLOs. But to wait 24 hours before giving the family
- 3 a thorough and proper update, that that would be
- 4 inappropriate?
- 5 A. Yes, but they should be given as much information as is
- 6 appropriate in the circumstances at that time, and they
- 7 had obviously been provided with a lot of information at
- 8 different stages from Police Scotland during the course
- 9 of that evening.
- 10 Q. You have been asked a question about -- it's in your
- 11 first Inquiry statement, I don't think we need to go to
- it, but you have been asked if there was ever any
- discussion with Pat Campbell about a joint deployment of
- 14 FLOs, so a Police Scotland FLO and a PIRC FLO.
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you remember any discussions of that sort being --
- 17 taking place --
- 18 A. No, definitely not.
- 19 Q. -- with Pat Campbell? Is that something that you have
- 20 experience of in the past, where you have joint --
- 21 A. No, the only joint thing that I would be aware of is the
- 22 formal handover process that I described, the respective
- 23 FLOs from the two organisations would have a very
- 24 detailed handover and then the FLOs would then introduce
- 25 the new FLOs to the family and have that formal

- 1 handover. That would be the process.
- 2 Q. So there would be some sort of physical introduction?
- 3 A. Yes, there would be. Normally anyway, yes.
- Q. Right, and that is when the Police Scotland FLOs and
- 5 PIRC FLOs would come together at that point?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Thank you. In hindsight, do you think now that it might
- 8 have been worth a phone call to the PIRC FLOs after that
- 9 third Gold Group meeting to see if they were available?
- 10 A. Honestly, I don't think so. As I said, I did consider
- 11 that, but for them to then, as I say, deploy within what
- 12 could be a fairly lengthy timescale, particularly given
- what had gone before, that if they were to arrive and
- 14 then attempt at the back of midnight, 1 o'clock in the
- morning to be introduced to the family, I didn't think
- in the circumstances that was appropriate, so I didn't
- do it.
- 18 Q. Did you take account of the fact there wouldn't need to
- 19 be a handover as such --
- 20 A. There would be because -- well, the FLOs would have to
- 21 be briefed properly so to what extent if they would get
- 22 a sufficient briefing to have a proper understanding of
- 23 what information could be conveyed to the family, what
- 24 had actually gone before in detail as regards any
- 25 misinformation that had been passed, it would be

- appropriate for them to be aware of all of that, and
  again, given the time of night that they might attend

  under the seriously question whether that would be
- 4 achievable. So thus it would be counterproductive.
- Q. Could you maybe help us understand -- you are obviously lead investigator, you are in charge of the investigation looking into the death of Mr Bayoh. What information -- if you had been in that situation and if there had been FLOs available, what information would you have wanted the FLOs to share with the family on 3 May?
- 12 Α. If we -- I would want them to share information that was 13 confirmed 100%. Anything -- you know, conjecture or 14 assessment of what may or may not have happened to my 15 mind wouldn't be appropriate. It would have to be factual. Ie that he had -- Mr Bayoh had come into 16 17 contact with the police, there had been some form of restraint and as a result -- and that this independent 18 19 investigation would be conducted thoroughly and come up 20 with the answers of what actually happened to him during 21 that.
- Q. In terms of the circumstances after the restraint or
  during the restraint, would you have been in a position
  to give the family any information about that?
- 25 A. I think at that stage we didn't have sufficient

- 1 information to say exactly what happened, so it
- wouldn't -- as I say, we wouldn't provide information
- 3 that we could not substantiate, which is -- again would
- 4 be counterproductive in the wider investigation.
- 5 Q. So is that the extent really of what you would have told
- 6 them, that he had come into contact with the police,
- 7 there had been a restraint and now PIRC had been brought
- 8 in as an independent body to investigate?
- 9 A. As you are aware, there was a variety of different
- 10 pieces of information that we had at different stages,
- and none of this was absolutely confirmed, particularly
- 12 with the officers that were involved in the restraint
- themselves. And there wasn't a lot of independent
- 14 witness evidence at that stage but that obviously
- subsequently came through the Inquiry and potentially
- that would be fed in to the family at different stages
- where appropriate.
- 18 Q. Would you have felt comfortable giving them this
- information and no more?
- 20 A. It would depend what it was. As I say, I don't know at
- 21 the different stages what it was, so I don't think it is
- 22 appropriate to comment on that unless I knew exactly
- what it was.
- Q. Can I ask you about -- can we look at the first
- 25 Gold Group meeting minutes actually, which is PS06491.

1 This is the Gold Group meeting, the first one, at 11.30 that morning, and can we look at item 3 on the agenda, 2 3 which related to the investigative process. We have 4 heard evidence that this was spoken to by Pat Campbell, 5 who was the SIO. I'm interested there in the fourth bullet point: 6 7 "FLO - Establish a working strategy." Is establishing a working strategy something -- this 8 9 is the first Gold Group meeting -- is this something at 10 the forefront of an investigation which is commencing into an unexplained death? 11 12 Α. Yes, and the FLOs would obviously have a significant 13 input into that and how they were going to approach 14 that. 15 Do you, as senior investigator or lead investigator, Q. have an input into establishing a working strategy? 16 I would have an input into -- in dialogue with the FLOs 17 Α. 18 themselves. 19 Then can we look at the second Gold Group Q. 20 meeting minutes which is PS07268. If we could look at 21 item 5 on the agenda. This is headed, "Family concerns." This is the second impossible group meeting 22 at 2.40. It says here: 23 24 "Discussion re [next of kin] Strategy identified as sister of deceased, Collette Bell, Girlfriend of 25

- deceased is currently within Kirkcaldy Police Station
- and has been informed a deceased person is in hospital
- 3 and that it may be her partner."
- Is a next of kin strategy the same as a FLO
- 5 strategy, or is it something different?
- 6 A. I would say it is something different.
- 7 Q. Can you explain what the difference is?
- 8 A. I haven't actually seen a next of kin strategy to be
- 9 honest. I can imagine what may be considered in it but
- I don't know the specifics of it.
- 11 Q. Have you ever seen a next of kin strategy?
- 12 A. Not physically, no.
- Q. Is it possible it is the same thing as a FLO strategy?
- 14 A. I don't think so, no.
- Q. No. Is it a phrase you have ever used, next of kin?
- 16 A. I don't recollect using that before, no.
- Q. Right. Tell us in relation to the FLO strategy then
- 18 what steps, if any, did you take to start to consider
- 19 a FLO strategy or formulate a FLO strategy or prepare
- for FLOs arriving?
- 21 A. No, I didn't have any involvement in that.
- 22 Q. That was nothing --
- 23 A. No.
- Q. -- that you were involved in? Did you instruct anyone
- in your team to start thinking about a FLO strategy?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Was that not something that you felt should be
- 3 prioritised?
- 4 A. It was prioritised from the Police Scotland perspective
- 5 and they would take responsibility at that stage for
- 6 that. And then once our FLOs were deployed it would be
- 7 a separate issue, it would be our responsibility.
- 8 Q. So was your expectation that Police Scotland would
- 9 develop the FLO strategy --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- initially? And when would PIRC start developing
- their own FLO strategy?
- 13 A. It would be the following day, when Alistair Lewis was
- 14 appointed from our organisations and he would progress
- that from his perspective.
- Q. Was that something that, as part of his role as a FLO,
- 17 he would develop --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- a FLO strategy? Would you contribute to that if you
- 20 had been lead investigator the next day?
- 21 A. I -- I probably would have done but I wasn't, as you are
- aware.
- 23 Q. I am aware of that. But is that something you would
- 24 have done, had you continued --
- 25 A. Yes, there would be dialogue between the lead

- 1 investigator and him.
- 2 Q. Can I ask you about some issues relating to
- 3 post-incident management. There was evidence given to
- 4 this Inquiry by Pat Campbell and by Conrad Trickett who
- 5 was the post-incident manager, I think we mentioned him
- 6 yesterday.
- 7 A. Yes, we did.
- 8 Q. We've heard evidence that at some point before the first
- 9 Gold Group meeting, prior to the meeting that
- 10 Pat Campbell had with you, that he had a conversation
- 11 with Conrad Trickett and indicated to him that
- 12 statements were not required at this time.
- Do you have any recollection of having
- 14 a conversation with Pat Campbell where you maybe
- indicated that statements were not required from the
- officers, the attending officers?
- 17 A. No, I have no recollection of that.
- 18 Q. Can you help us understand -- you are obviously
- 19 PIM-aware, post-incident procedures, you have had some
- 20 awareness training in relation to that. What are basic
- 21 facts?
- 22 A. Basic facts are kind of a short summary, general
- 23 information given in the first instance after a critical
- 24 incident which is coming from the officers involved, so
- 25 the PIM would basically put that together from the

- information that he had from the officer or group of officers at the time, so that is the first stage of that
- 3 process.
- Q. We've heard evidence that there are four stages?
- 5 A. Yes.

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And different -- there's basic facts, there's initial accounts. We have heard that detailed statements from officers would not be expected until perhaps 48 hours
- 9 after the event?
- 10 A. That is correct, yes and that would be either scripted
  11 by the officers or members of police staff themselves or
  12 invariably taken by PIRC investigators at the sort -- on
  13 that sort of timescale.
- Q. Would you see a distinction between what we've heard are called operational statements -- and officers have described self-penning or writing out their own statements of what happened at an event, they have called that an operational statement -- a distinction between that and what may be called witness statement, perhaps taken by a PIRC investigator?
  - A. An operational statement is a phrase -- to my mind a statement is a statement and they may be a brief statement initially but a more detailed statement covering the whole incident and actions and use of force, et cetera, would be more detailed. So I don't

know where they are referring to the operational
statement is in effect at that stage the initial account
which is normally written, which is a brief account of
what occurred during the incident. And then, as I say,
that is followed up at an early stage within that time
period with a full detailed statement covering hopefully
everything.

- Q. We may have heard -- we have heard evidence from

  Conrad Trickett, who was the post-incident manager, that

  from his perspective there was no need to get basic

  facts from the officers because the basic facts were

  already known. Would you -- from a PIRC perspective do

  you take the view that the basic facts were already

  known during the day on 3 May?
- A. No, I don't think so, because you know initially there's differing accounts that I got of the incident and I know that was the case later as well, where there was things that never occurred that were referred to, so ...

Through that process, that is definitive, you get the basic fact, you get initial account and you go to that final stage where you get the statements, so there's -- you don't deviate, would be my view, from that process if you were involved in the post-incident procedure. Whether there is a viewpoint that, you know, in general terms that basic facts of the incident are

- 1 already known.
- 2 Q. From the perspective of the PIRC investigation, would it
- 3 have been of assistance to you to get basic facts?
- 4 A. Definitely, yes.
- 5 Q. And then later initial accounts?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Then ultimately more detailed statements?
- 8 A. Yes, at a later stage.
- 9 Q. Would that be some point after 48 hours after the
- 10 incident?
- 11 A. Yes, round about that, it would be normally the
- 12 following -- not the next day but the following day.
- But you would already have some sort of account, as
- I say, within that initial account.
- 15 Q. Thank you. Can I move on and ask you about the contact
- you had with the family on the evening of 3 May. You
- said you made a couple of calls?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And you then did visit the family?
- 20 A. I did, yes.
- Q. Can we look at SBPI 00259, and we will look at -- this
- is your Inquiry statement, and we will have a look at
- paragraph 53. You say:
- 24 "After the Gold Group meeting that evening, I made
- 25 several unsuccessful attempts to contact Ade Johnson.

About 2145 hours, I spoke to Mr Johnson by telephone and arranged to see him and other members of Sheku Bayoh's family at Mr Johnson's home. I then attended there at 2210 hours. I was introduced to Mr Johnson and requested to speak to him in private. When I went in there was a large group there. My operational notes, at page 9, record that there were approximately 16-18 other persons there in addition to Kadi and Ade Johnson. I am assuming some were family members, but I didn't know who everyone was, so to my mind it was actually much more appropriate to meet one-to-one initially. If then I'd been requested to speak with the assembled group and explain everything to see if things went - then that would've been fine but, at the initial stages to speak to Mr Johnson and convey the information that I wanted to initially seemed to me the most appropriate way to deal with that, but that was rejected. I was asked to sit in the living room along with my colleague, Alex McGuire and the other persons would were present. My statement describes that~..." And you have this in quotations: "... 'Mr Johnson began to outline his displeasure in the way that the Police Scotland personnel had communicated information to him which differed and

conflicted significantly. He intimated that he wished

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- to make a complaint regarding this and I outlined the
  appropriate channels if he wished to make a complaint to
  Police Scotland'."

  Can I ask you about this meeting. You were with
  Alex McGuire, who you have mentioned yesterday I think?
- 6 A. Yes, I was.
- 7 Q. He was taking the role of scribe?
- 8 A. Yes, and any other relevant functions that we had to undertake and he accompanied me to the house.
- Q. Can I ask why you selected Alex McGuire? Because

  yesterday you gave evidence that he was not from the

  local area. He was not from -- sorry, Strathclyde?
- 13 A. That is correct.
- Q. Was there a particular reason you selected Alex McGuire to go with you to see the family?
- 16 A. The other four investigators had specific functions
  17 obviously to deal with the two locations and were fully
  18 involved in that. So Alex was available at that stage.
- 19 Q. So there was nothing specific about his background --
- 20 A. No, not at all. No.
- Q. -- or anything of that sort. Given the comments in
  quotations there that you have noted down, did you feel
  that the atmosphere in the house and the communication
  you had with the family was consistent with the
  description you had heard at the Gold Group meeting from

- 1 Garry McEwan about the way the family were feeling at
- 2 that time?
- 3 A. In some ways, yes. There was clearly grief with the
- 4 group, which was wholly understandable in the
- 5 circumstances. There was an element of anger and there
- 6 was certainly frustration which -- from what Mr Johnson
- 7 articulated and the differing pieces of information he
- 8 had, so that was fully understandable given what they
- 9 had been told.
- 10 Q. You have talked about Mr Johnson being displeased at the
- 11 different and conflicting information that had been
- given to them --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. -- by Police Scotland. Did you take details of that?
- 15 A. No, I didn't write down specifics, and it really
- 16 wasn't -- it was kind of difficult in the circumstances
- and I think that -- again, if I tried to communicate,
- 18 the circumstances that we had in front of us, and the
- 19 emotions et cetera, it would have been -- I didn't think
- 20 that would be appropriate to do that either. And
- I think that was just in general terms what I notes at
- some stage once I left the house.
- 23 Q. So you didn't take notes when you were in the room?
- A. Not in the house, no.
- 25 Q. Did you not feel that would be appropriate in the

1		circumstances?
2	Α.	No, not in the circumstances, no.
3	Q.	So the operational notes you took later, were they
4		how long later after the meeting did you prepare that?
5	Α.	I don't know, I think I returned to Kirkcaldy.
6		I don't have a recollection of, you know, sitting in the
7		vehicle that I was in and doing that when I left
8		the house, so it was at some reasonably early stage
9		after that, I can't be more specific.
10	Q.	How long did the meeting with the family take; do you
11		remember?
12	Α.	I would be guessing, maybe 15-20 minutes, something like
13		that.
14	Q.	Did you return to Kirkcaldy Police Station
15	Α.	I think so, I think so.
16	Q.	immediately after the meeting? You have talked about
17		the family having anger and frustration. Can you
18		explain, was it was that exclusively in relation to
19		the different and conflicting information that they had
20		received from Police Scotland or was it for other
21		reasons as well?
22	Α.	As part of the discussions obviously I had to touch on
23		the arrangements for the post mortem and obviously the
24		initial feedback is aware that there was considerations
25		that they had for other family members, specifically

- 1 Mr Bayoh's mother I understand was travelling, which
- I took -- from England somewhere, I wasn't sure where
- 3 she was located, and that they did not want anything to
- 4 do with that until she had arrived and had discussions
- 5 in relation to that.
- 6 Q. Was there any mention during that meeting about concerns
- 7 the family had about obviously the actions of the police
- 8 officers, that they may have been due in some part to
- 9 Mr Bayoh's race?
- 10 A. No, I don't remember anything in relation to that, no.
- 11 Q. Were there any discussion or comments made about recent
- events that were in the media, about recent events in
- Baltimore; do you remember anything along those lines?
- 14 A. No, I don't recall anything.
- Q. We have heard evidence from a DC Wayne Parker, who was
- 16 responsible for delivering the death message -- one of
- the officers responsible.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And a DC Andrew Mitchell, who was the other officer
- 20 responsible for delivering the death message, saying
- 21 there was some discussion that this incident may have
- 22 been similar to one in Baltimore in America. Was any
- 23 part of the discussion you had with the family about
- events, recent events?
- A. Not to my recollection, no.

- 1 Q. Any reference by the family that evening that there
- 2 may -- concerns they had there may have been racial
- 3 element in the death of Mr Bayoh?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. To what extent were you aware that this would be
- a significant event publicly, that a man had died after
- 7 contact with the police and he was a black man; to what
- 8 extent was that something that you were conscious of on
- 9 3 May?
- 10 A. Yes, I was conscious of it, and I knew that certainly
- 11 there would be a lot in the media in relation to it.
- 12 There would be a focus on the events and the subsequent
- investigation.
- 14 Q. To what extent did that awareness or that consciousness
- of that impact on your role as lead investigator on
- 16 3 May?
- 17 A. It was just one of many considerations. I was certainly
- aware of it, I wasn't blind to it. That is certainly
- 19 the case.
- Q. When you say you were not blind to it, how did that
- 21 awareness translate in terms of any actions that you
- 22 took or any steps you took as part of the investigation?
- 23 A. It was all -- it was all part of the thinking and
- 24 consideration of any of the actions. I don't know if
- 25 you are focusing specifically on the media attention

- side of things or just in general?
- Q. Well, let's look at the media. Did you have any -- did
- 3 you take any particular steps in relation to the media
- on 3 May that were -- that we would like to hear about?
- 5 A. No, I fed back information and briefed Mr Casey
- 6 regularly on that, who was liaising with our media
- 7 representative for the PIRC at that time, and with
- 8 I understand Crown as well in relation to any media
- 9 releases, so he dealt with that.
- 10 Q. Are PIRC possible for liaising with the media in
- 11 a situation like that where there is a PIRC
- investigation going on?
- 13 A. Yes, in those circumstances not directly but they would
- 14 liaise with their counterparts within Police Scotland or
- what other agency was involved. And obviously because
- it was an investigation referred by Crown, they would
- 17 communicate with them also in relation to any media
- 18 releases that were being considered.
- 19 Q. Were you involved on 3 May with any discussions about
- 20 press releases or media interest or anything --
- 21 A. No. Not from my recollection, not directly, no, other
- than feeding information into the process.
- 23 Q. I'd like to -- you have mentioned the arrangements for
- the post mortem and I would like to move on to that.
- 25 A. Yes.

1	Q.	Can we look at paragraph 55 of your Inquiry statement.
2		It says here:
3		"After explaining to the family regarding the PIRC
4		role and function, I then advised the family that
5		Crown Office had made arrangements for a post mortem
6		examination on the afternoon of Monday, 4 May."
7		So by the time you visited family in the evening on
8		3 May you had had a conversation with David Green, had
9		you, about the post mortem arrangements?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	And you were aware that arrangements had been made for
12		a post mortem the following day?
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	You said:
15		"I asked for two family members to make themselves
16		available to attended the city mortuary in Edinburgh to
17		identify the body."
18		Then you make a reference to page 9 of your
19		operational notes. I don't know if you want to have
20		a look at them as we go through it. I will read out the
21		quotation here. It says:
22		" 'Adi indicated stated the family had discussed
23		matters and no representatives were willing to do the
24		identification until family members, including the now
25		deceased's mother attended She was travelling with

a group, including elders from England'. My understanding of this was that the family were refusing to do the identification in the timescale outlined. I don't think it was the intention that it would be the mother that would do the identification, but that they were not willing to participate in that process until she arrived~... I'm aware she was travelling from down south or was about to travel. I don't have any recollection of being advised as to when she would arrive. I got the impression she was in the process of travelling but I don't think established where she was actually coming from other than it was somewhere in England. I think it was suggested that they would arrive at some time the following day, which was the Monday, and obviously the post mortem was arranged for midday on the Monday. I have been asked if the family understood that I was the Crown's ..." That should maybe be "it":

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"... it was the Crown's decision as to the timing of the post mortem. Yes, I think so. I'd explained specifically it was the Crown's decision. My statement records that Mr Johnson wasn't willing to be more specific on the expected arrangements of the arrival of the family members etc. That part of the conversation was closed down."

1 So I would like to go through the circumstances of this if I may. First of all, when you say there, "That 2 part of the conversation was closed down", who closed 3 4 the conversation down? 5 I think we had -- the discussion we had in direct Α. relation to that had been exhausted by that stage. 6 7 Mr Johnson had clearly articulated the family position that it was significant to them that they could make no 8 9 further decisions or arrangements in relation to who 10 would carry out that function in relation to the post mortem until they had arrived and the timing of 11 12 that was unspecific, so I think what is meant by that is 13 the conversation ended, we were both -- on both sides 14 were clear what the respective positions were, and it 15 was then just to communicate that information back to 16 Crown at an early stage to see how that would be approached the following day. 17 18 Q. Where did this conversation take place? 19 In the living room. Α. Who was present during this conversation? 20 Q. 21 Mr Johnson, his wife, and several other people. From Α. 22 memory. It all took place -- there was a short conversation, I don't know whether it was when I was 23 leaving the house or when I first entered, it took part 24

I think in the hallway at the front door. But that was

25

brief, but I'm sure that the majority -- the vast

1

2 majority of the conversation we had was with the 3 collective group of people that were there. 4 Q. Do you remember Collette Bell being present? 5 Α. No. Or her mother? 6 Q. 7 I wouldn't have known -- I wouldn't have been able to Α. identify either of them at that stage. 8 Q. Did you have a discussion about the post mortem with 9 10 Collette Bell --11 A. No. 12 Q. -- at separate time? 13 Α. No. 14 Had you seen her during that visit to the family? Q. 15 Α. I'm unaware of whether she was there or not, I'm not 16 sure. Q. Can we look at your operational notes please of this 17 meeting with the family. So it's page 9, this is 18 19 PIRC 01468. I will try and read this out, if I get it 20 wrong you could perhaps point that out to me. It says 21 22.10: "Attended at home address at ..." 22 23 That is redacted: 24 "... with Alex McGuire and met with family. In house were Ade and Kadi Johnson and approximately 16-18 25

```
other ..."
 1
                 Is that "persons"?
 2
             "Persons", yes.
 3
         Α.
 4
             "... Ade confirmed he had been elected as family
         Q.
             spokesperson. The family appeared~..."
 5
             "... clearly upset~..."
 6
         Α.
         Q. "... clearly upset and angry~..."
 7
                 Perhaps I should actually ask you to read this; do
 8
             you mind?
 9
10
         Α.
            Yes, fine:
                 "Ade stated that they were angered and frustrated by
11
12
             the differing and conflicting information provided by
13
             Police Scotland officers and they intended to make
14
             a complaint re them. Brief overview of this process
15
             given and the requirement to make complaint to
             Police Scotland direct. They were advised of the PIRC
16
             role and function. I outlined this would ..."
17
                 I think that should be "be", it doesn't say "be":
18
                 "... a fully independent and thorough Inquiry
19
20
             conducted by experienced investigators. I also outlined
21
             arrangements in place for the post mortem on 4 May, 2015
             at Edinburgh. Ade indicated the family had discussed
22
             matters and no representatives were willing to do the
23
             identification until family members including now
24
             deceased's mother attended."
25
```

- 1 Q. Carry on to the next column.
- 2 A. "She was travelling with a group, including elders from
- 3 England. Ade also indicated that he intended to go to
- 4 the media and consult with local councillors regarding
- 5 these issues."
- 6 Q. Thank you. From that description, which you prepared
- 7 after your meeting with the family, is it fair to say
- 8 that you were made aware by the family that they were
- 9 not refusing to identify the body per se but they wished
- for Mr Bayoh's mother to be coming up from London and
- 11 that they effectively wished the post mortem delayed
- 12 until after she had arrived in Scotland?
- 13 A. Yes, I would agree in general terms.
- 14 Q. Certainly we have heard evidence from Kadi Johnson who
- said she tried to explain to PIRC that her mum -- she
- has given evidence that her mum was in London, they
- 17 would be arranging for her to come up the next day,
- which would have been the Monday and they would arrange
- for that and to go and identify the body once she was
- 20 there. Do you agree with that evidence?
- 21 A. I don't remember specifically that wording but it's kind
- of similar to my understanding that the timing --
- 23 timeframe was too short and that they wanted the
- 24 relatives, particularly Mr Bayoh's mother, to be there
- 25 before they entered into that process.

- 1 Q. Thank you. We hope to hear evidence later in the
- 2 Inquiry from Alistair Lewis, who was later appointed as
- 3 the FLO, and he has an entry in his FLO log that you had
- 4 spoken to the family on 3 May and you had advised Lewis
- 5 that the family's single point of contact was
- 6 Ade Johnson and you had spoken to him regarding the need
- 7 for a post mortem. He has said in his log:
- 8 "This was refused regarding formal ID as mother was
- 9 travelling from England with family elders."
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. So did you pass that information on to Alistair Lewis?
- 12 A. Yes, first thing in the morning.
- Q. Was that on 4 May?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. Again, we have not heard evidence from Dave Green in the
- Inquiry yet, we hope to, we do have a statement from him
- 17 regarding the events and I think it is noted in your
- operational notes that at 23.35, so this is on -- just
- 19 the next column, the same day, so after your meeting
- with the family, 3 May, 23.35 you actually contacted
- 21 Dave Green at Crown Office, and I will get to you to
- read out that passage from your operational notes, if
- you would.
- 24 A. 23.35?
- 25 Q. 23.35 that day.

1	Α.	"Updated Dave Green COPFS re the ID issue for
2		post mortem. Alternative arrangements discussed for
3		selected police officers to carry out ID function. Goes
4		ahead."
5	Q.	In Dave Green's Inquiry statement, if we look at
6		SBPI 00227, and looking at paragraph 4 I think.
7		(Pause). Sorry, I will confirm the position with that.
8		I think I have the wrong reference in my note. But what
9		he has said in that statement is:
10		"Late that night, about 23.30 hours I think, I was
11		advised by PIRC that the family had indicated that they
12		would not attend the mortuary to ID"
13		Mr Bayoh:
14		"I instructed that the post mortem should proceed as
15		arranged. My reasons for this were that in my view it
16		was essential to ascertain the cause of Sheku Bayoh's
17		death as soon as possible."
18		As I say, we have not heard evidence yet from
19		Mr Green, and I am just putting those words to you
20		because they are in a statement from him. But it would
21		appear that his understanding during that late night
22		conversation with PIRC was that the family had indicated
23		they would not attend the mortuary to identify Mr Bayoh.
24		So it was not apparently it was not his understanding
25		that they were effectively asking for the post mortem to

- 1 be delayed while waiting for the mother to come up from
- 2 London. Do you have any comment about that, if that is
- indeed what he speaks to in evidence?
- 4 A. Other than saying that I summarised the visit to the
- 5 house and specifically in relation to the response for
- 6 the arrangements in place for the post mortem at that
- 7 time, and I am fairly confident that I told them
- 8 regarding the expected visitors travelling and that
- 9 there would be no decision finally made on that until
- 10 they had arrived, so basically accurately summarising
- 11 the discussion with Mr Johnson in relation to the
- 12 arrangement for the post mortem.
- Q. Can you give any -- think of any reason or any
- 14 explanation why Mr Green may have formed the impression
- from that conversation that the family were simply
- refusing to attended to ID Mr Bayoh's body?
- 17 A. No, I cannot.
- 18 Q. I also understand that Mr Green may give evidence that
- 19 he expected you to call the family again after that
- 20 discussion the following morning to see if they had
- 21 maybe changed their mind?
- 22 A. Yes, I recall that, and that was done the following day
- as well.
- 24 Q. I think my understanding of Mr Green's position is that
- 25 he thought that conversation the following morning would

- be to see if the family could -- had changed their mind
- 2 that they would come and identify the body. Do you
- 3 remember if you had the same view? Were you trying to
- 4 change the family's mind or was it for some other
- 5 reason?
- 6 A. Part of the reason -- well, initially part of it was to
- 7 introduce Alistair Lewis but obviously one of the
- 8 priorities with that first contact with the family again
- 9 in the morning was to try and get that representation at
- 10 the post mortem as well.
- 11 Q. Can I ask, would there have been any reason why you
- 12 couldn't have asked David Green to delay the post mortem
- on the Monday?
- 14 A. To be honest it is not for me to interfere in that
- 15 process. I am unaware of how -- what the availability
- of the appropriate people are, including the pathologist
- and what was available, whether that day or further
- ahead in the timescale on that. It is not for me. He
- 19 was aware of all the circumstances that were relevant in
- 20 relation to the scheduling of that.
- 21 Q. We have heard evidence that ultimately the decision for
- 22 a post mortem is for the Crown --
- 23 A. Crown, yes.
- 24 Q. -- to make. I wonder to what extent PIRC could be
- 25 persuasive in relation to the timing of the post mortem,

- 1 where PIRC are aware of particular wishes being
- 2 expressed by the family?
- 3 A. That had occurred earlier in the day, I think we
- 4 discussed that previously, where there was an initial
- 5 consideration for having the post mortem that day. On
- 6 that occasion I was asked by Mr Green for an opinion in
- 7 relation to that.
- 8 Q. So you gave your opinion to David Green on 3 May?
- 9 A. At his request, yes.
- 10 Q. At his request or invitation?
- 11 A. Yes, his invitation.
- 12 Q. In relation to the timing of the post mortem?
- 13 A. Whether it was feasible or practical in the
- 14 circumstances, and my response was, particularly at that
- early stage, not knowing too much about it at that
- stage, that I didn't view it as practical at all so that
- 17 was I think then thereafter was dismissed as
- 18 a consideration.
- 19 Q. So he took on board -- on the 3rd, earlier on the 3rd he
- 20 took on board your comments and did not have that
- 21 post mortem that day?
- 22 A. I assume so, I don't know if it was directly
- attributable to that or otherwise.
- Q. We know the post mortem didn't take place on the Sunday.
- 25 A. Yes, we do.

- Q. Did you not feel that you could again offer an opinion
  and perhaps persuade him to delay the post mortem on the
  Monday?
- 4 Α. I didn't choose to give an opinion or apply any specific 5 request in that regard. He was -- as I say, he was 6 fully aware of everything I was aware of at that time 7 and the circumstances regarding the family. Obviously you have mentioned already from what you have told me 8 9 that his major consideration, and I fully appreciate 10 that, was to -- in the absence of other information, that we didn't have at the time was to, as soon as 11 12 practicable, to get a cause of death.
- 13 Q. In the circumstances you were in on the Sunday and the
  14 Monday, there were no FLOs deployed to the family --
- 15 A. No.
- Q. -- the family had expressed concerns. They were upset,
  angry, frustrated. Can you explain why you didn't
  choose to give your opinion to David Green about perhaps
  delaying or deferring the post mortem until the mother
  had arrived?
- A. As I say, I didn't know what the alternatives were.

  Again, that wouldn't be something that I would ask him.

  He is a very senior member of the Crown Office, and

  I didn't feel it was my position to push for any sort of

  alternative. He was armed with all the relevant

- information on the feelings of the family in relation to
  that, and he has clearly had uppermost in his mind as
  regards finding out medically what hopefully caused the
  death at that stage, which was very important for the
  investigation moving forward, so I chose not to pursue
  anything else in relation to those arrangements. He
- 8 Q. Thinking about that communication between you and
  9 David Green, you have said it wasn't your position to --

knew what the facts were.

10 A. No.

7

- 11 Q. -- do that. Did you feel on an equal footing with

  12 David Green, because you are lead investigator of PIRC,

  13 you are in charge of the investigation into Mr Bayoh's

  14 death, he has asked your opinion previously, and he is

  15 a member of Crown Office, a senior member. Did you feel

  16 he was -- he had more authority than you or you couldn't

  17 speak to him on an equal footing?
- A. No, not that I couldn't speak to him but certainly on
  that topic, that was for him to decide as long as he had
  the full facts that were available at the time.
- Q. Do you feel he did have the full facts about the family's concerns and their wishes?
- 23 A. Yes, I do.
- MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I wonder if that might be an appropriate time to break.

- 1 LORD BRACADALE: We will stop for 20 minutes.
- 2 (11.32 am)
- 3 (A short break)
- 4 (11.52 am)
- 5 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
- 6 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I would like to move on to 4 May,
- 7 and you will see in your operational notes actually, on
- 8 page 9 that we were looking at before, that you head it
- 9 up, "Monday 4 May", so you were still in the office
- 10 I think you said that day.
- 11 A. Yes, I was.
- 12 Q. I will be asking you about some items on page 10. I'm
- interested in the call you made to Ade Johnson at 10.30.
- 14 So that is on page 10 of your operational notes which
- 15 are PIRC 101468. Or is that 01468. An extra 1 has
- slipped in there. It's page 10 that I am interested in.
- Before I look at this on the screen, I think you
- have already said that you made a call to Ade Johnson on
- the morning of 4 May?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And you -- one of reasons was to attempt to introduce
- 22 him to Alistair Lewis, who was going to be the FLO?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. If we look at the operational notes on the left-hand
- side halfway down that page you will see:

1		"10.30. Call to Ade Johnson."
2		Could you read that out please?
3	A.	"Call to Ade Johnson. Confirmed family not willing to
4		attend the post mortem and identify body. I confirmed
5		to him that Crown directed post mortem to go ahead as
6		planned. I asked if I could attend this morning with
7		Alistair Lewis to introduce FLO. He declined and stated
8		he was in discussion with solicitor who would contact
9		PIRC on their behalf. I arranged a call back and
10		provided him with a contact number for Alistair Lewis."
11	Q.	And then is that another call to Ade Johnson at 10.50?
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	At the bottom of that page, and can you read that entry
14		please?
15	A.	"Call to Ade Johnson's mobile. No response. Message
16		left to contact PIRC/Alistair Lewis on FLO mobile. Also
17		left message with Kadi Johnson at home address to have
18		Ade contact Alistair Lewis on the number provided."
19	Q.	And then it says, "Update from Alistair Lewis", is that
20		when you had a discussion with Alistair Lewis?
21	A.	Yes, I don't know, there is obviously not a time against
22		that but it is running at some point that morning:
23		"Deceased family have appointed Aamer Anwar
24		solicitor to represent family~"
25		I think there is a mobile number there.

1 "Alistair spoke to Mr Anwar and will take a few days to collate information. He is making a complaint to 2 3 local Chief Superintendent re seizure and search of ..." There was an address there. 4 5 So the call you make so Ade Johnson on the morning of Q. the Monday is just before you are advised that 6 7 Aamer Anwar has been instructed as the solicitor representing the family? 8 Yes, that is correct. 9 Α. 10 Q. Let's look at your Inquiry statement. Paragraph 59, please. This is also in connection with that telephone 11 12 call to Mr Johnson at 10.30. 13 Α. Yes. 14 "This was an attempt to introduce the family liaison Q. 15 officer, Alistair Lewis. Mr Johnson was asked again regarding the availability of somebody to carry out the 16 17 identification of Sheku Bayoh, and he declined to do that. There wasn't any extension to that, that would 18 require more time to consider it or whether people would 19 20 be available. I have no recollection of any further 21 discussion." 22 I wonder if you can explain what is written there. So Mr Johnson -- you asked Mr Johnson on the phone about 23 the availability of somebody to carry out the ID of the 24

body, and he declined to do that. Obviously in the

25

- 1 operational notes from 3 May in the evening, the visit
- with the family --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- they didn't want to identify the body until the
- 5 mother came from London?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. So it was conditional upon the mother's arrival. But
- 8 here it says he was asked about availability of somebody
- 9 to carry out identification and he declined to do that.
- Then you go on to say there wasn't any extension to
- 11 that. I'm just wondering what that sentence there
- 12 actually means?
- 13 A. To my mind there was no further conversation during that
- 14 call in relation to arrangements, so the function of the
- phone call was twofold: to make arrangements to
- introduce Alistair Lewis, but to revisit the discussions
- 17 that I had with Mr Johnson the day before, if, one,
- things had moved on or whether there was
- 19 a reconsideration of being involved in that process.
- I don't know whether -- I don't think I got an update of
- 21 whether any of the relatives had arrived at that stage,
- the conversation wasn't that involved.
- 23 Q. Did you speak about the arrival of the mother,
- Mr Bayoh's mother?
- 25 A. I can't recall that. I think I would have mentioned

- 1 that if I had.
- 2 Q. Do you remember if you asked about the mother, her
- 3 travel plans?
- 4 A. I don't recall I'm afraid.
- 5 Q. Was there any reason why you felt you couldn't ask for
- 6 an update on the mother --
- 7 A. I don't think so, that may have been part of the
- 8 conversation to establish if she had actually arrived or
- 9 not, but I don't recall that specifically, and I've not
- 10 noted anything in that regard.
- 11 Q. Was there any -- do you remember asking about the timing
- of arrival or when she was expected, or anything along
- 13 those lines?
- 14 A. No, I don't remember anything further in relation to
- 15 that.
- Q. Can I ask, when you were on the call with Mr Johnson did
- 17 you take the view that there was a change in the
- family's position on that morning, or a hardening of the
- 19 family's position? Or did you -- was your impression
- 20 that their position had not changed since the previous
- 21 night?
- 22 A. No, I -- yes, I don't think their position had changed.
- I wouldn't say it had hardened, there had obviously been
- 24 discussions, other discussions, and obviously we got the
- 25 information that they had contacted a named solicitor,

- 1 to represent the family.
- Q. When you noted at that subsequent entry in your
- 3 operational notes that Mr Anwar was representing them,
- 4 you say he was to represent the family. Did you know
- 5 who the family was, the identification of the family
- 6 members? Was he representing the whole family?
- 7 A. Well, Mr Johnson had been -- had been nominated as
- 8 representing the wider family, was my understanding,
- 9 which included his wife, and I would assume Mr Bayoh's
- 10 mother and any other relevant family members. So that
- 11 kind of point of contact in relation to the family
- 12 was -- my understanding -- was being passed to the
- 13 solicitor.
- 14 Q. What about Collette Bell, Mr Bayoh's partner, and the
- mother of his baby?
- 16 A. Whether that was part of the -- the group being
- 17 represented? It may be. I didn't have any knowledge of
- that either way.
- 19 Q. Did you seek to clarify that?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. We know that mention had been made of Collette Bell in
- 22 the Gold Group minutes, the Gold Group meeting minutes,
- 23 she had been brought to Kirkcaldy Police Office.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. A statement had been taken in Kirkcaldy. There is

- 1 mention of this in the minutes. There is mention of the
- 2 death message having been delivered to her at Kirkcaldy
- 3 Police Office.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. The officers had sought the details of the next of kin
- from Ms Bell. Did you raise the issue of Ms Bell at
- 7 all?
- 8 A. No, I did not.
- 9 Q. Is that the sort of thing that FLOs would be involved
- 10 in?
- 11 A. Yes, I would anticipate that that would be part of the
- subsequent discussions they would have with the family
- and that sort of -- the significant and relevant network
- 14 of individuals that had to be kept informed or
- information had to be obtained from would be identified
- and that would be dealt with moving forward.
- Q. So someone such as Alistair Lewis may be able to assist
- 18 with this?
- 19 A. Very much so.
- 20 Q. But part of his role as FLO would be to define the
- 21 family members --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- and explore the wider family issue?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. I see. There is no reference in these operational notes

- for the morning of 4 May, or even later that day, of you
- 2 calling David Green back to update him about the
- family's position on the post mortem. Was there a call
- 4 with David Green later that day?
- 5 A. Erm, I don't know if anyone -- I didn't, but I'm not
- 6 sure if anyone else, part of the PIRC did, or not.
- 7 Q. Did you ask anyone else to call David Green and update
- 8 him about the family's --
- 9 A. No, I don't think so, no.
- 10 Q. Given that you were the one who had the conversation
- with the family on the 3rd and with Mr Johnson on the
- morning of the 4th, is there anyone else in PIRC who
- 13 could have updated David Green or would have been aware
- that he was expecting a call?
- 15 A. It's possible. I think by that time Billy Little was in
- the office, and other senior managers within the PIRC.
- So they were -- they would be aware of the update from
- 18 these early conversations that morning.
- 19 Q. Did you consider on the morning after your conversation
- 20 with Mr Johnson phoning David Green again and asking him
- 21 to reflect on the timing of the post mortem?
- 22 A. I don't have any recollection. As I say, that
- 23 information would have been passed for definite, but
- 24 whether there was further dialogue with Mr Green on that
- 25 topic, that is outwith my knowledge.

- 1 Q. When you say the information would have been passed,
- 2 what do you mean?
- 3 A. Generally the update of conversation that the position
- 4 was still that the family would not become directly
- 5 involved in that, and conversation -- clearly there was
- 6 going to be conversation with the family solicitor as
- 7 a follow-up to that conversation, and hopefully the
- 8 introduction of Alistair Lewis formally to the family.
- 9 Q. So the -- you think the information would have been
- passed to David Green, is that ...?
- 11 A. No, I'm saying the other PIRC managers were definitely
- aware of what came out of that telephone conversation.
- I don't know what happened thereafter and whether there
- 14 was any conversation with Mr Green.
- Q. It may be that we will hear from Mr Green. So on that
- morning, after the call with Mr Johnson, your
- operational notes obviously deal with that call,
- a number of calls before that, and then an update at
- 19 4 o'clock. There are fewer entries for 4 May than there
- were for 3 May.
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Was this the day that you handed over the role of lead
- investigator to Billy Little?
- 24 A. Yes, I don't know exactly what time that was but it was
- fairly early on, on the morning of 4 May.

- 1 Q. Is there any note in your operational notes about that
  2 handover to Billy Little?
- 3 A. No.
- Q. Is there any paperwork that describes the briefing that you gave to Billy Little?
- A. I don't think so, no. Other than it would be very much
  based on the document that I created at the very latter
  stages of the 3rd, which he would have a copy of that.
- Q. I will come on to that and we can have a look at that in that moment. Before I do that can I ask you some questions about Collette Bell. At any stage, either on 3rd or on the 4th, did you receive confirmation from anyone -- Ade Johnson, anyone at all -- that either Mr Johnson or subsequently Aamer Anwar was to be the single point of contact for her?
- 16 A. Not to my knowledge, no.
- Q. Did you at any time ask if Collette Bell was of the same view as the other family members, Kadi Johnson,

  Ade Johnson, about not wanting to identify the body until the mother had come from London?
- 21 A. No, I am unaware of that.
- Q. Looking back now, obviously with the benefit of
  hindsight, do you think that perhaps that would have
  been a sensible thing to do, to contact Collette Bell
  herself direct, to discuss the post mortem arrangements?

A. Possibly in hindsight and whether, you know, she may have offered to do that, the identification.

Q. I would like to talk to you about some evidence we have heard from Collette Bell on Day 40, February last year. She had said when she was in the police station she had been under the impression that if she got her statement done, so the statement that was given in Kirkcaldy Police Office that morning, if she got that done then she would be able to go and see Sheku Bayoh. Her mum had said to her, "Let's just do the statement and then maybe you will get to see him after".

Then in relation to the post mortem she had found out that the post mortem had already taken place, but only on the Tuesday, so the 5th, or after the 4th certainly, when she was in Aamer Anwar's office. She gave evidence to the Inquiry that she was under the impression that they needed permission to do the post mortem. She says:

"Answer: I remember when I was in the police station they had said they would need to be identified, so nothing could go ahead without him being identified anyway. And I just remember thinking: but he hasn't been identified so how have they managed to do post mortem? It was my understanding that they would need permission to do that."

1 She says: 2 "Answer: I remember on 3 May I stayed up really, 3 really late, obviously upset, but I kept thinking: why 4 have they not contacted me to go and see him yet? And 5 I remember saying to my mum, 'I thought they were going 6 to phone me to go and see Shek', and then I was like, 7 'But I don't have a number to get in contact with them, surely they will just get in contact with us', because 8 I had made it very, very clear to them that I wanted to 9 see him." 10 11 Were you aware that Collette Bell wanted to see 12 Sheku Bayoh? 13 No, I was never made aware of that. Α. 14 Who would you have expected to tell you about that? Q. 15 Α. It would come through Police Scotland and probably more than likely Pat Campbell. 16 Would you consider that from information about 17 Q. 18 Collette Bell to be important for you to know, that she 19 really wanted to see Sheku Bayoh? Yes. And that would be again significant information 20 Α. 21 that would be passed to the family liaison officer. 22 When you say passed to the family liaison officer, Q. am I right in saying not just to the family liaison 23 officer, but --24 It would be passed to PIRC, obviously, in the first 25 Α.

place but then that would be the primary person to be 2 subsequently made aware. Would you also be a person that should be made aware of 3 Q. 4 that? On the 3rd, certainly, yes. 5 Α. She said she didn't realise there was different ways 6 Q. 7 that a body could be identified. I asked her about the impact of her not seeing Sheku Bayoh prior to the 8 9 post mortem and she said -- I had asked her: 10 "Question: What impact has not being able to see him before the post mortem had on you?" 11 12 And her answer was: 13 "Answer: Really bad. I think because I didn't get 14 to say goodbye, I didn't get to see him, even now 15 I think maybe they still got it wrong. Like, I know they didn't get it wrong, I know it was Shek, but 16 17 I often find myself thinking maybe they did get it wrong, maybe it wasn't actually him. I often have 18 19 nightmares and things about it, that I will be walking 20 down a beach on holiday and Shek will be coming towards 21 me. I think it is just I didn't have that closure 22 and I didn't have that time to say goodbye because it was so sudden, and then not being able to see him, it 23 has had a massive impact on me." 24 Hearing that evidence perhaps for the first time, 25

1

- I wonder if you would like to comment given the impact
  that not having the opportunity to view the body has had
  on Collette Bell?
- 4 A. I can understand that and she has conveyed that quite vividly in what he has said.
- Q. So looking back now, do you think that getting in touch
  with Collette Bell and speaking to her directly about
  the post mortem might have been a very valuable thing to
  do?
- 10 A. Possibly.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You only think possibly? She has also given evidence to 11 Q. 12 the Inquiry about the visit in the evening. She said it 13 was around 10 o'clock and she thinks it was people maybe from PIRC. So she wasn't able to name anyone but we 14 15 know that you and Mr McGuire attended after 10.00 that 16 evening. Her impression at the time was that you were 17 very rude and quite aggressive -- not you specifically but the people from PIRC. And she says: 18

"I just remember them being very rude and quite aggressive. I just remember thinking: I just wish you would go away."

She was to make a list, she said, after that of things she would need from the house, and she asked for Shek's pillow and a hoodie of his. Do you have any comment to make about that evidence, the impression that

- 1 you were -- that people were PIRC were rude and
  2 aggressive?
- I mean, the people collectively, and I would think that 3 Α. 4 I did the vast majority of the talking, if not all of it 5 during that time, so it's -- it's not in relation to the organisation, that would be directed I would assume at 6 7 me. It's very disappointing to hear that, obviously I address that, and some of the comments that are made, 8 9 that she wasn't the only member of the family that had made similar comments. I started off the initial 10 conversations with, quite rightly, giving condolences to 11 12 the family and understanding the position they were in, 13 how they must have felt at that particular time. It was 14 extremely difficult circumstances, and it's 15 incomprehensible for me to be unprofessional and rude and arrogant in any sort of way, that just is not the 16 17 reflection of any of the discussion or period of time
- 19 Q. You are not a trained FLO?

that I spent in the house.

20 A. No.

18

- Q. I wonder if there were trained FLOs in the house that
  evening, at that late point in the evening, do you think
  that would have aided the communication with the family
  in relation to matters to do with Mr Bayoh?
- 25 A. It's hard to -- I can only focus on how I think the

1 conversation with the various family members went and my recollection of that, and I have spoken to many, many 2 3 individuals and family representatives over a long 4 number of years, passing death messages, speaking about 5 deceased victims, I have done that an awful lot so I do have a lot of past experience in that. I think I know 6 7 how to approach people with empathy and understand the circumstances, so as I say, again it is very 8 9 disappointing to hear that that is the perception of how 10 I was received and what I said at the time. We have heard evidence that delivering a death message 11 Q. 12 and speaking to bereaved families can be a particularly 13 difficult job for police officers. Of course it can. 14 Α. 15 Is that something you would agree with? Q. 16 Α. Yes. Is that a similar experience for officers from --17 Q. investigators from PIRC, although you are not 18 necessarily delivering a death message, being in that 19 20 environment with bereaved families? 21 We still have the need to talk to people and communicate Α. 22 with them in relation to these very difficult sets of circumstances and everybody's response to that situation 23 is very different, and can be sometimes significantly 24 different and you have to adapt to those circumstances 25

1 as that develops. In relation to Ade Johnson, we have an Inquiry statement 2 Q. 3 which indicates that he also considered the approach of 4 yourself and Mr McGuire as being arrogant and he further 5 stated in paragraph 25 of his statement: "They talked down to us as though we were idiots, 6 7 black people who didn't have a clue. But of course like the police they were shocked by the questions we asked 8 9 and our failure to comply with their stereotypes." 10 Do you have any comment to make about that statement by Mr Johnson? 11 12 Α. No, other than I would just reiterate that, as I say, it 13 is very unfortunate and disappointing from my 14 perspective that -- that there is that sort of 15 perception. In relation to the accusation that, "They talked down to 16 Q. 17 us as though we were idiots", do you feel that is a fair reflection of the way you were speaking? 18 Not at all. Not at all. 19 Α. 20 The suggestion that you thought black people didn't have Q. 21 a clue; do you have any comment to make about that? Definitely not. I don't think that for a minute. 22 Α. Q. He said: 23 24 "... like the police they were left in shock at the questions we asked." 25

- Did you have surprise or shock about questions that

  were asked by the family?
- A. I wouldn't say so. If there were questions in that
  regard put across I don't have any recollection of
  questions like that being asked, I certainly -- as
  I said, I went there with a purpose to communicate with
  the family, display some empathy and try for them to get
  an understanding of how things would move forward, and

spend as long a time there as was required.

- Q. When you were with the family that evening on 3 May did
  you have in your mind, either when you went to the house
  or during your time in the house, did you have any
  stereotypes or racial stereotypes in your head as to how
  the family would be or how they would communicate with
  you?
- 16 A. Absolutely not, no.

9

- Q. Let's move on to the briefing document that you
  mentioned a moment ago. PIRC 03694. And I think you
  said you prepared this on 3 May. The date is given at
  the top as 3 May. Was this prepared over a period of
  hours or was it prepared in one go?
- 22 A. Mm-hm, yes.
- Q. When did you start preparing this?
- A. I don't really know the starting time. It was probably
  a small part of it done during a period at Kirkcaldy

- 1 Police Station, and probably the majority was done when
- I got back to the office, I recall.
- 3 Q. And --
- 4 A. Our own offices, sorry.
- 5 Q. Did you go back to the office on the 3rd or did you go
- 6 back to your office on the 4th?
- 7 A. No, back to our office on the 3rd.
- 8 Q. So was this after your visit to the family, you returned
- 9 to Hamilton?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. So the calls that you made after your visit to the
- family to Green and Pat Campbell, were they from the car
- or from the Hamilton office?
- 14 A. It probably -- it could be either/or, I am not quite
- 15 sure. I know the call to Mr Green was a fair length of
- time after, but I couldn't be 100% sure where I was,
- 17 whether it was while we were driving or whether it was
- 18 back at the office.
- 19 Q. So we know that you attended at the family's home at
- 20 22.10.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. From page 9 of your operational notes and then the call
- to David Green is at 23.35.
- 24 A. Yes, so --
- Q. Does that help you?

- 1 A. We probably -- I reckon about 20-25 minutes maybe at
- 2 Mr Johnson's home which would take us to ... maybe 25 to
- 3 11, 20 to 11, so close to an hour probably after that
- 4 that I eventually spoke to David Green.
- 5 Q. So do you think during that period you were travelling
- 6 back to Hamilton?
- 7 A. I don't -- I don't remember how long I spent at
- 8 Kirkcaldy. In fact, I'm not 100% sure actually whether
- 9 we just drove straight from the Johnsons' and then drove
- 10 straight back to Hamilton. It's quite vague as far as
- 11 whether I went back to Kirkcaldy Police Station for
- 12 a short time or not.
- Q. All right. Let's look at this briefing note. It's
- 14 a briefing note for the director of investigations, my
- 15 understanding at that time the director of
- investigations was John Mitchell?
- 17 A. That is correct.
- 18 Q. And I understand that he will say that he returned to
- work on 5 May, which was the Tuesday.
- 20 A. Yes. As far as who that is for, the information, that
- 21 would be kind of standard practice but that document
- 22 would be for sharing with the PIRC managers and
- 23 potentially used as a briefing document in some fashion
- for investigators as well. But it would still be headed
- for the director of investigations, just as a standard

- 1 process.
- 2 Q. So this document could be used on 4 May, and I asked you
- 3 about Billy Little earlier today.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Was this document used when you briefed Billy Little?
- A. I don't know if it was used but he would have sight of
- 7 that, as would the other PIRC managers that were on duty
- 8 first thing that morning.
- 9 Q. So would they receive copies of that?
- 10 A. Yes, I think it would have been circulated at the time,
- 11 they would certainly have seen it.
- 12 Q. When on 4 May did you hand over the role of lead
- investigator to Billy Little?
- 14 A. I mentioned that before, I don't know, it was some time
- 15 I think fairly early in the morning that a decision was
- made, I think potentially by either one of the
- senior investigators or the head of investigations,
- 18 Irene Scullion.
- 19 Q. Did you do a briefing at that time, personally give
- a briefing?
- 21 A. To the managers, yes.
- Q. Who were the managers?
- 23 A. I don't know who was all present at the time, whoever
- 24 was in that morning, so Billy Little would have been one
- of them. And I don't -- I can't remember if

1 John McSporran was there that morning or whether he came back to duty the following day, but any of the senior 2 managers who were on duty would have been fully briefed 3 4 and that would be a part basis of what that was --5 On the basis -- partly on the basis of this document? Q. Yes, and obviously a lot of things would be added to in 6 Α. 7 some degree by myself. And you would have your operational notes to rely on if 8 Q. 9 necessary? 10 Α. Yes. What was your expectation after briefing the managers; 11 Q. 12 was it that they would then cascade information out to 13 the wider team? Yes, where required and getting the response or what was 14 Α. 15 seen as the priority actions for later that day. Can we look at first of all page 2 of the briefing. At 16 Q. the bottom of page 1 it says: 17 "Incident - involvement with police." 18 So it's a summary of your -- the information you had 19 available; is that correct? 20 21 Α. Yes. 22 Then looking at page 2, if we can look at paragraph 4 on Q. that page. You will see the paragraph, it says: 23 "It was reported ..." 24 This is you indicating what information you have 25

- 1 available about the incident?
- 2 A. Yes.

23

24

25

- Q. Where it says, "It was reported", is that a specific reference to an individual that is reported to you?
- A. No, I would say that is the collective from the information that we had and forming a summary of what that was, what was known at the time.
- "It was reported that as the officers drove into 8 Q. 9 Hayfield Road they saw the now deceased coming towards 10 them as the vehicles came to a halt. They could clearly see he was in possession of a knife and was making his 11 12 way towards them. Some of the officers, unknown how 13 many at this stage, drew their police issue batons. At 14 least one of the officers also drew their PAVA spray and 15 issued a warning towards the now deceased, who continued to come forward. PAVA was subsequently sprayed towards 16 17 the now deceased, however this had little effect, there is some reference to him laughing at the officers. It 18 was also reported that one of the female officers was 19 20 apparently kicked in the back and also sustained a blow 21 to the back of her head. She sustained no serious injury as a result but complained of pain. 22

"As the PAVA had little effect, a number of the officers struck the now deceased with their batons.

It is unknown at present how often he was struck or how

many officers struck him. A struggle then ensues and 1 2 the now deceased was eventually taken to the ground 3 where he was handcuffed to the rear. Due to his 4 constant struggling, leg restraints were also applied to him." 5 So on the basis of that information, that briefing 6 7 document, it appears that the suggestion that the subject was the aggressor and the police responded with 8 9 spray and batons again appears to be the understanding that you had at that time? 10 (Inaudible) collective summary of the information that 11 Α. 12 I had at different stages. 13 So still no accounts from the officers who were at the Q. 14 scene? 15 Α. No. So you are still reliant at that point on the 16 Q. 17 information that we looked at yesterday --18 Α. Yes. Q. -- that indicated that the subject was the aggressor? 19 20 Can we look at your paragraph, please -- sorry, your 21 Inquiry statement, paragraph 139. The second Inquiry statement, sorry. I should have said that. It's 22 paragraph 139. This is a series of questions that you 23 24 were asked about this briefing note and in particular about page 2 and the entries that I have read out from 25

1 there. I wonder if we can look at your response, 2 please. You say: 3 "This part of the briefing document was based on the 4 accounts provided to me in the first instance, by 5 [Superintendent] Craig Blackhall, then [Detective Superintendent] Campbell and 6 7 DI Colin Robson." Yesterday we looked at the information you got from 8 David Green, Craig Blackhall and Pat Campbell. We 9 didn't -- I didn't ask you about information you 10 received from Colin Robson. Was that consistent with 11 12 the information you had had from the other three, or 13 different? Again, there were similarities but there were some 14 Α. 15 differences within that as well, and this was based solely on his update at the Gold Group meeting of the 16 17 facts known at the time, so that was -- I can't recall how much was reflected within the minutes of that, but 18 that was notes kind of taken during the course of that 19 20 meeting, and again there were variances and subsequently 21 inaccuracies in that as well. Right. This would be the second Gold Group meeting, the 22 Q. first one you attended; is that right? 23 24 Α. Yes. 25 Q. So can we look at those minutes again, please. PS07268.

So this is the second Gold Group meeting at 14.40. We 1 2 can see that Detective Inspector Robson was present on 3 page 2. Item 3, "Investigative process", it was 4 actually spoken to by Pat Campbell. We have heard about 5 that. It appears that Detective Inspector Robson speaks to item 5, which related to family concerns. Is it 6 7 possible that it was at a different meeting or a different discussion? I wonder if you could look 8 at --9 10 Α. I think it was the first Gold Group meeting. Can we look at the minutes for the first Gold Group 11 Q. 12 meeting. PS06491. We have heard evidence from 13 Detective Inspector Robson that he had attended that 14 first Gold Group meeting at 11.30 in the morning but we 15 know you weren't present at that? 16 Α. No. I think you said you wouldn't have received the minutes 17 Q. 18 for that. At item 2 on the agenda, starting on page 1, 19 it says: 20 "Synopsis of events provided by DI Robson which 21 included circumstances of initial calls ... verbal 22 account of police engagement with the male ... update on the injury to PC Short~..." 23 24 It says towards the bottom of page 1: "... consideration with regards to the incident 25

involving recording and seizure of a knife believed to 1 be in possession of the male. The welfare of the 2 3 officers concerned and identification of significant 4 witnesses was also outlined. 5 "The events relating to the deceased being 6 conveyed~..." 7 So it would appear that at the first meeting that DI Robson's update indicates that there was reference to 8 9 a knife believed to be in possession of the male. There 10 doesn't seem to be anything more in the minutes with 11 regard to that update. 12 Α. Yes. 13 Was that the part of the information that was shared Q. 14 with you? 15 Yes, there is definitely -- my recollection was that Α. during one of the Gold Group meetings he provided 16 17 an operational update on basically what was known and we made reference to that ultimately in this briefing 18 document, and obviously one of the significant things 19 20 was in relation to the knife etc being presented, which 21 ultimately was not the case. However you obtained the information given by DI Robson, 22 Q. is it fair to say his account and the account he shared 23 with you was consistent with the other three accounts? 24 In general terms, yes. There were some differences, as 25

- 1 I said earlier.
- Q. We may hear from John Mitchell that he was given
- a briefing on 5 May when he returned and it was on the
- 4 basis of this briefing document. So it would appear
- 5 that you have talked yesterday about cascading of
- 6 information, would it appear that on the basis of your
- 7 briefing note, although you stepped down from the role
- 8 of lead investigator --
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. -- that the summary that we see on page 2 of the
- 11 briefing note about -- I am calling it subject
- 12 aggressor, police taking action in defence, that
- information was then being shared with others on 4 May
- and on 5 May?
- 15 A. I think that is likely, yes.
- Q. And there was no information available from the police
- officers at the time --
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. -- that would have contradicted any of that?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. Do you know why you were removed from the role of lead
- 22 investigator and Billy Little was brought in in that
- role on the 4th, given that then John McSporran came on
- 24 the 5th?
- 25 A. Yes, I think we discussed that yesterday. There was

awareness that I was due to go on annual leave and that 1 was within a period of days, I think it was near to the 2 3 end of that week and the decision was made that it was 4 more appropriate to change it immediately so 5 Billy Little could run with that from what was -- well, day two effectively. As opposed to it would cause more 6 7 issues leaving it for a period of days and then changing it thereafter. That was the more sensible decision. 8 Q. Okay. Can I ask you to look at the fourth Gold Group 9 10 meeting minute. PS03161. This was a Gold Group meeting on 4 May, so the Monday, at 12.30. I think in your 11 12 Inquiry statement you say you have no recollection of 13 being made aware of this Gold Group meeting. No, I certainly wasn't there. 14 Α. 15 By 12.30 would you have handed on the role of lead Q. investigator? 16 I believe so, yes. 17 Α. We have also heard evidence that no one from the PIRC 18 Q. 19 was present at this meeting. Are you aware why 20 Billy Little didn't attend this meeting? 21 Α. No, I'm not. 22 Do you have any recollection on that morning of hearing Q. of concerns that were being expressed by Police Scotland 23 of the handover and the change of lead investigator 24 25 between --

- 1 A. Not -- I don't think about the lead investigator but
- 2 I think there's -- in my operational notes there's
- 3 reference to a call with ACC Nicholson I think, but that
- 4 was partly I think to do with the range of the
- 5 investigation at that time, and also some issues being
- 6 raised about the introduction of the FLOs and perceived
- 7 delays in that. But as we have discussed, that was
- 8 ongoing from first thing in the morning.
- 9 Q. So that was between Little and Nicholson, you were not
- involved in that?
- 11 A. No, I don't think I was but I was made aware of in
- general terms the concerns, let's call them, that were
- being raised at that time.
- 14 Q. So you were still being kept in the loop to some extent
- on 4th May?
- 16 A. Yes, I was aware -- I was in the office for the major
- part, if not all of the day, so I was aware of --
- Q. Were you available to other investigators if they had
- 19 wished to come and speak to you?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Did any of them come and speak to you, specifically
- about this investigation?
- 23 A. I don't have any specific recollection, I spoke to
- 24 a number -- obviously I spoke to Alistair Lewis at
- 25 length, Billy Little as well, and I would have spoken to

- others but as far as relaying what conversations took
  place, I wouldn't be able to confirm that.
- Q. Tell us about your conversation with Billy Little. Do you remember ...?
- 5 Not a great deal about it other than I would have gone Α. through, basically summarised the whole incident, the 6 7 actions that had been taken, potentially we would have discussed the issues in relation to the post mortem and 8 9 obviously there was things late in the day that had to 10 be arranged in relation to that. So -- and that was I think various people were tasked to -- to do various 11 12 actions in relation to that.
- Q. We've got the minutes of this Gold Group meeting on the
  screen. Can we look at page 2. This is effectively
  item 3 on the agenda, "Investigative process", spoken to
  by DI Stuart Wilson. If we can go just above halfway
  down there are some tasks identified above item 4 on the
  agenda. It says here -- so PIRC were not present at
  this meeting, we have heard, and I don't think --
  - A. I am not sure. I don't know whether -- I'm pretty sure
    Billy Little was not there but I'm unsure whether there
    may have been another representative there that is not
    listed.
- Q. We can maybe ask Billy Little to clarify that. But certainly you weren't present at this meeting?

20

21

22

23

1 No, I definitely wasn't present. So the task here is: 2 Q. 3 "Advice to be gained from PIRC regarding the disclosure of the PM results to the Officers involved in 4 5 the incident. Supervisor to be identified to carry this disclosure out." 6 7 I'm interested in whether you had any knowledge about this suggestion that the results of the 8 9 post mortem should be disclosed to the officers involved? 10 No, I wasn't a party to any discussions in that regard. 11 Α. 12 You weren't aware of any of that then, that day? Q. No, not then. But obviously post that I am aware. 13 Α. I would like to move on then, please and talk to you 14 Q. 15 about 13 May. I don't know if you were back from holiday that day or if you were still on holiday? 16 No, I wouldn't have been back. I was away for two weeks 17 Α. at least. I probably went away around about, as I say, 18 the end of that week or that weekend. 19 I would just like to ask you for your general view. 20 Q. 21 Obviously you were acting as lead investigator at one 22 time in this investigation, and you are a very experienced member of staff at PIRC. We have some 23 evidence available to the Chair that Ade Johnson gave 24 a statement to PIRC and I will summarise this for you.

25

He describes having a meeting with DC Mitchell and DC Parker, they were the two officers who delivered the death message on the afternoon of 3 May, so they are Police Scotland officers. And he said in that statement he was told, if I can summarise four things: that Mr Bayoh was pronounced dead in the ambulance on the way to the hospital, they didn't know how Mr Bayoh had died, the police were looking for two guys, and there had been a warrant out for the arrest of Mr Bayoh.

Now, obviously there are differences between what people say they delivered as part of death message and what the family say they were told as part of the death message. I am not asking you to comment on any of that. But I am interested in the fact that after Mr Johnson gave that statement to PIRC nobody went back to Mitchell and Parker and asked them to comment on these different statements that had been made. I am wondering in your perspective whether you think as lead investigator that would be a topic of some interest to the PIRC investigation into the way that the family had been handled? Do you think that maybe someone should have gone back to Mitchell and Parker to ask about this?

A. I don't know if you -- I seem to have some recollection I was possibly present when Mitchell was interviewed,

- 1 I don't know to what extent that was and what that
- 2 actually incorporated. I think -- I mean it's clearly
- 3 relevant information, particularly in relation to -- did
- 4 you mention two persons that were of interest that ...
- 5 Q. Police looking for two guys~...
- 6 A. Yes, which --
- 7 Q. This was on 13 May that Mr Johnson gave this statement
- 8 so you were on holiday the day he gave the statement,
- 9 but that would be the point at which PIRC would have
- 10 something in writing about this issue.
- 11 A. Yes, I mean the statement would -- all statements would
- 12 be read in detail and any actions highlighted within
- that, that were appropriate to follow up, whether that
- 14 was re-interview or interview other persons in relation
- 15 to that. But obviously I can't comment on what was done
- with that statement and specifically that information.
- Q. Given -- if you take from me that PIRC had that
- 18 statement and it contained some concerns that the family
- 19 had about the information they were being given, do you
- 20 think that is the type of thing that PIRC would
- 21 ordinarily want to go back and ask officers about, given
- the disparities?
- 23 A. It depends what information they had already; whether it
- 24 was viewed that there was an answer to that question
- 25 already. But that is hypothetical, as one potential out

- 1 come from it. So without knowing the specific facts and the reasoning when that statement was read, that it 2 wasn't warranted as following up, it is hard to say. 3 4 Q. So if they had an explanation or another statement that 5 explained the situation, then they may not go back to Mitchell and Parker? 6 7
- That is possible. Α.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- If they didn't have an explanation or an understanding Q. of how this disparity had arisen, in that situation would you expect PIRC to go back to Mitchell and Parker?
  - I would expect the information to be -- if it was Α. thought as relevant and important, that it would be bottomed out in whatever fashion to -- and if that, you know, that may mean further interviews, as I said, or establishing from elsewhere, someone else.
  - So that was 13 May that Mr Johnson gave this statement. Q. On 12 June, so roughly a month later, and after the PIRC had received statements from the officers on 4 June, the terms of reference for PIRC were expanded by Crown Office to include investigating allegations by the family that they had been provided with misleading and erroneous information concerning the death of Mr Bayoh. So at that point there was an instruction from Crown for PIRC to formally investigate this aspect. We had the statement from Mr Johnson -- you had the statement from

- 1 Mr Johnson and the formal instruction from Crown.
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. At that point would you expect an investigator from PIRC to go back to Mitchell and Parker and ask follow-up
- 5 questions?
- 6 A. Clearly what you have outlined as far as an additional
- 7 direction incorporates what you are talking about from
- 8 what you have conveyed there, so the answer to that
- 9 would be yes.
- 10 Q. It appears that they were never asked about Mr Johnson's
- 11 allegations, Mitchell and Parker, about this misleading
- 12 and erroneous information. Looking back now, do you
- think that that was maybe an omission that should have
- 14 been rectified by PIRC?
- 15 A. There may be an explanation for that. As I said,
- it's ... I have no knowledge of that other than that
- 17 there was an extension of the direction from the Crown
- in relation to that. But it is hard to know without
- 19 looking at the detail of these statements and what
- 20 actions were subsequently identified as a result of that
- 21 additional Crown direction.
- 22 Q. So again, if there was maybe some other source of
- 23 information available to PIRC that provided the
- 24 explanation or the answer to any apparent disparity,
- 25 PIRC would not need to go back?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. But in the absence of that, they probably should have
- 3 gone back to Mitchell and Parker?
- 4 A. When that additional direction came in, as I say, I'm
- 5 sure there was a thorough approach to that, in
- 6 identifying what actions had to be completed and who had
- 7 to be interviewed to fully exhaust that line of enquiry.
- 8 That would be what would be required.
- 9 Q. Can I ask you questions about 8 July. So again --
- 10 A. Moving on.
- 11 Q. -- moving on. I would like to ask you about
- 12 Kirsty MacLeod. We have heard evidence that she was the
- partner, now the wife, of Martyn Dick.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Now initially when the police were investigating the
- 16 events leading up to Mr Bayoh's arrival at
- 17 Hayfield Road, that was one of the properties that they
- were involved in?
- 19 A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
- Q. You talked yesterday about a parallel investigation.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Kirsty MacLeod was -- gave an initial statement but she
- 23 was questioned again on 8 July, so two months after
- Mr Bayoh had died, and she was asked questions about
- 25 where Mr Bayoh had obtained his drugs. We have heard

- evidence he had taken illicit drugs on 3 May. I am
- interested in why PIRC, if you know, wanted to explore
- 3 that avenue as part of the PIRC investigation; that you
- 4 would go back to Kirsty MacLeod a second time and ask
- 5 her questions about Mr Bayoh's supply of drugs. It
- 6 wasn't part of the terms of reference directed by the
- 7 Crown Office, I should say for the avoidance of any
- 8 doubt. So why would that be of interest to PIRC?
- 9 A. Who the actual supplier was?
- 10 Q. Yes.
- 11 A. Or what commodity --
- Q. Where he obtained his drugs. Who the supplier was.
- 13 A. There could be a number of reasons. One of them in
- 14 particular what drugs had at any time specifically been
- supplied, if that was the case.
- 16 Q. The question was where he obtained his drugs, not about
- 17 what drugs he obtained.
- 18 A. But that may be part of the reason for establishing
- that, is to subsequently establish, identify what kind
- of drugs.
- 21 Q. So you think that might have been an interesting part of
- the investigation?
- 23 A. Yes. As I say, I've got very little knowledge in
- 24 relation to that, kind of behind those actions. I have
- 25 certainly visited that house. I don't know if I spoke

- 1 to that lady or not, but I was there at one -- it may
  2 have been to speak to Martyn Dick possibly.
- 3 Q. This is 8 July. We have a statement from a Brian Dodd.
- 4 You know Brian Dodd?
- 5 A. Yes.
- Q. He has given the Inquiry a statement, and he speaks to
  the questioning of Kirsty MacLeod around the potential
  supply chain associated with Mr Bayoh's drugs. He says,
- 9 and I quote:
- "I was not involved in the decision-making process

  regarding these matters. I believe that this would be

  public safety related."
- So he suggests that perhaps it was a public safety
  matter and that is why Kirsty MacLeod was approached
  another time and asked about the supply of drugs. Would
  you think that is a plausible explanation?
- 17 A. It's a possibility, but there could be others. It's

  18 fairly speculative without knowing any specific facts

  19 on -- surrounding what the reason behind an action being

  20 raised to re-interview that individual to establish that

  21 information.
- 22 Q. Would that be a matter for the lead investigator --
- A. Yes, absolutely, yes.
- Q. -- to maybe speak to? We can maybe ask Mr McSporran.
- 25 Out of interest, do PIRC have a public duty or

a statutory authority to investigate issues of public 1 safety in terms of the supply of drugs? 2 Not to investigate it, but if we become aware of 3 Α. 4 a public safety issue, we certainly have a responsibility to report that and take action 5 appropriately, particularly in case, you know, that 6 information that we came across was -- subsequently led 7 to any tragic event. So we have a responsibility to 8 9 ensure that that is dealt with, I would say. Who would it be reported to? 10 Q. Probably the police. 11 Α. 12 MS GRAHAME: All right. I would like to move on to some 13 questions about the -- going back in a sense to when the 14 police officers gave statements to PIRC, and that was on 15 4 June 2015. I would like to move on to that and ask you some questions, but I am also conscious of the time. 16 17 Would that be a suitable moment? LORD BRACADALE: Yes. We will stop for lunch and sit at 18 2 o'clock. 19 20 (12.58 pm)21 (The short adjournment) 22 (2.00 pm)23 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 24 25 I was about to move on to 4 June 2015 and there's

- evidence available to the Chair that the officers agreed
- 2 to provide statements to PIRC, roughly the communication
- 3 began on 2 June and, then as I understand it
- 4 arrangements were made for the officers to attend and
- 5 provide those statements.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Were you aware that that had moved on --
- 8 A. I was.
- 9 Q. -- from the initial stages? And, as I understand it,
- some of the officers were in different locations, some
- of them were in the same location. They weren't all
- 12 together.
- 13 A. When the interviews took place?
- Q. When the interviews took place.
- 15 A. I think the majority, from memory, were done at offices
- 16 at the Scottish Police College.
- Q. When it was arranged, were there two PIRC investigators
- interviewing every officer?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Was it all happening at the same time?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Were arrangements made or was there to be breaks during
- 23 that period?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Were those breaks designed to allow the PIRC

- 1 investigators to confer, maybe compare what the officers
- were saying?
- 3 A. I think both. As far as comfort breaks well. I think
- 4 they were fairly lengthy as well.
- 5 Q. Right. As I understand it those statements were taken
- 6 over the course of that day, on 4 June?
- 7 A. Yes, they were.
- 8 Q. This would be PIRC getting the accounts of the attending
- 9 officers, and that would be the first accounts they had
- 10 received from those officers?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Did you at any stage become involved in doing
- comparisons between statements or considering versions
- that had been given by different officers?
- 15 A. After these statements were taken?
- 16 Q. After these statements were taken.
- 17 A. I don't think so, no. I have no recollection of that.
- Q. Or during the breaks were you involved in any
- 19 discussions?
- 20 A. Possibly dialogue with other investigators who weren't
- 21 involved directly in the interviews, possibly, but
- I can't remember any specific conversations like that.
- 23 Q. Do you remember actively discussing issues with any of
- 24 the other investigators in relation to accounts that
- 25 were being given?

I don't have any direct recollection of doing that. 1 Α. 2 Let's look at your second Inquiry statement first of Q. all. It's covered -- this is covered in paragraphs 166 3 4 to 175 and we will get that on the screen. So that is 5 SBPI00382, and if we look at paragraph 166 first of all. 4 June 2015, and you will see that you are being asked 6 7 a question in connection with you taking a statement from PC Craig Walker, and you are asked about the 8 9 process and the statement taking and your impressions, 10 and your answer is: "I have some limited recollection of taking the 11 12 statement at the Scottish Police College ... with 13 Investigator ..." Is that Ungi? 14 15 Α. Ungi, yes. "I followed a witness interview strategy while taking 16 Q. the statement. However, I do not have sufficient 17 recollection of PC Walker to provide any impressions of 18 him. A number of PIRC investigators were taking witness 19 20 statements at the same time at the [Scottish Police 21 College]. However, I cannot recall what contact I had with them during this period." 22 Then over the course of the next few answers that 23 you have given you talk again about the witness 24 interview strategy, and I won't need to go through all 25

- of these answers, and your contact with PC Walker. So,
- 2 was that the task you were allocated that day, along
- 3 with the other investigator, was to take a statement
- 4 from Constable Walker?
- 5 A. Yes, it was.
- ${\tt Q.}$  We have heard evidence that he was one of the first two
- 7 officers at the scene?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. In terms of your approach did you consider him to be
- 10 quite a significant witness?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Was that one of the reasons you were selected to take
- his statement, because of your experience?
- 14 A. Possibly, I don't know definitively but I would think
- 15 so.
- Q. Let's look that the witness interview strategy. It's
- 17 PIRC 04182. Do you know anything about how this
- strategy was prepared, collated?
- 19 A. I think from memory we have qualified or trained
- 20 interview advisers and I think they created that,
- 21 obviously from a lot of information that was accrued
- 22 during the course of the Inquiry up to that date,
- obviously we then had, you know, eyewitness accounts and
- information from a variety of locations, so there would
- 25 be a kind of summary of events, which I think is there,

- is created, and then work out in conjunction with the
- lead investigators what questions are going to be posed.
- A lot of these will be unique to that individual, but
- 4 probably the majority in this instance would be similar
- 5 as regards how they became involved in the incident,
- 6 what they actually did at specific times, what use of
- 7 force, et cetera.
- 8 Q. You do recognise the front page of this is the -- we
- 9 have been provided with one witness interview strategy,
- so this appears to be a generic version.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Was it a generic version that was prepared for your use
- on 4 June?
- 14 A. Yes, but I think that was -- each of them were specific
- to the certain officers I think, from recollection.
- I don't know if all the questions were exactly the same,
- I don't remember.
- 18 Q. So you think there may have been a specific witness
- interview strategy for each individual officer?
- 20 A. Yes. I don't remember fully but I would anticipate that
- 21 might have been the case. But I'm not sure.
- Q. Is that something that is commonly done?
- 23 A. It would be, depending on their involvement. The likes
- 24 of somebody who is front and centre of what has happened
- but somebody else is maybe coming after the events but

- 1 for whatever reason they decide a strategy is required
- 2 for that individual, then they would probably be quite
- 3 different.
- 4 Q. Is that common practice now for PIRC when they were
- 5 interviewing officers, to be looking for a specific
- 6 witness interview strategy?
- 7 A. It is not that often -- it is not that common we would
- 8 use this, obviously a very critical incident that we
- 9 create these to support, other than that in normal
- 10 investigations the lead investigator would create
- something on a smaller scale for the interviewing
- investigators specific to that Inquiry. But this is not
- particularly common to go into this significant detail.
- Q. So in a more common PIRC investigation, if there is such
- a thing, there will maybe be fewer witnesses?
- 16 A. Yes, fewer witnesses, maybe not as wide array of
- information that requires to be obtained in relation to
- 18 whatever incident it is we are investigating.
- 19 Q. So in a smaller PIRC investigation you may have
- 20 individual strategies for individual witnesses?
- 21 A. Possibly, yes.
- Q. Possibly?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. But more commonly is there simply no strategy and PIRC
- 25 rely on the experience of investigators such as

1 yourself? 2 Yes, to some degree, the actions that we create, that is Α. 3 a kind of computer-generated document that will outline 4 the information that we expect to get or want to get 5 from a specific witness, they will probably be details within that. But, as I say, there was a lot of 6 7 information to obtain and we obviously wanted to try and get that without follow-ups if that was possible. 8 LORD BRACADALE: Could I clarify something please, 9 10 Mr Harrower. When you talk about interview advisers, who are they; are they PIRC officers? 11 12 A. They are PIRC investigators who have a trained skill set 13 in relation to supporting major investigations where 14 part of that function is to create documentation. That 15 can either be for witness strategies or for suspect persons occasionally as well, in preparation for 16 17 an interview. LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. 18 19 MS GRAHAME: Do you remember which adviser prepared the 20 witness interview strategy here? 21 Α. I'm afraid not. No, I don't remember. 22 Is that something that the lead investigator would be Q. liaising with the adviser on? 23 I would say so, yes. 24 Α.

Q. So whoever was the lead investigator on or prior to

25

- 1 4 June, he would be the best person to ask?
- 2 A. Yes, they would be very au fait with what was contained
- 3 within that and may -- would certainly have input to
- 4 that as well.
- 5 Q. Had you used a witness interview strategy document in
- any investigations in PIRC prior to 3 May 2015?
- 7 A. I don't know about prior, certainly after that I think.
- I wouldn't be able to say what it was but I have
- 9 certainly used it in the last 11 years. As I say, it is
- not common, it's not something that we would use very
- often.
- 12 Q. Do you have any recollection of using a strategy such as
- this prior to 3 May?
- A. Not specifically. No, I wouldn't be sure, no.
- 15 Q. Had you been given any training or guidance about the
- use of a witness interview strategy during the process
- of taking a statement?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Had you used these when you were a police officer?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Did you have experience of using these when were you
- 22 were involved in major crimes?
- 23 A. Yes, major crime investigation, yes.
- Q. Had you had training with the police on how to use these
- 25 strategies?

- 1 A. No, I don't think it was -- there was obviously specific
- 2 training for the interview advisers that are referred to
- 3 in creating these but not for implementation and taking
- 4 statements, I don't think. It may have been
- 5 incorporated within certain courses and touched on but
- it wasn't, to my recollection, specific training.
- 7 Q. Do you remember any courses that touched on how to use
- 8 a witness interview strategy effectively?
- 9 A. No. I would be guessing. Probably one in particular
- 10 but I wouldn't -- I couldn't be factual whether that was
- 11 the case or not.
- 12 Q. So if we move down this first page we see it's in
- 13 relation to the death of Mr Bayoh, and it gives his date
- of birth then there is a list of bullet points of
- officers who are to be questioned in terms of this
- 16 witness interview strategy.
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. And they range through Paton, Walker, Gibson, Tomlinson
- 19 Good, Maxwell, McDonagh, Short, Smith, and you were to
- 20 be interviewing Craig Walker?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. If we can move on to the next page, we see the summary,
- and the opening paragraph comments that there were
- 24 a number of calls received reporting a black male in
- 25 possession of a knife on Hendry Road near to

1		Hayfield Road and then it goes through the identities of
2		the nine officers, and the report that was made, and it
3		says:
4		" they saw the male walking towards them and that
5		he may have been in possession of a knife (Comment: It
6		may be that the knife was discarded before this)."
7		That appears to be a change in the summary compared
8		to the information you had had previously?
9	Α.	Yes, as I referred to there, that this should be and
10		would be up-to-date with the investigation at that
11		stage, that things had moved on and obviously they'd
12		established where the knife had been recovered, and
13		potentially that that wasn't as initially reported in
14		the early information that we had.
15	Q.	The comment there is that:
16		"( It may be that the knife was discarded before
17		this)."
18		That would be on the basis of further information
19		that has come to the attention of PIRC?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	"The officers exited their vehicles. It was
22		reported that the male punched, then kicked, PC~
23		Nicole Short. Some officers drew their police issue
24		batons. Some of the officers also drew their PAVA and
25		CS sprays, which were subsequently sprayed towards the

1		male, however it is believed this had little effect."
2		So however continuing in this paragraph, does it
3		appear that the primary report there is that the male
4		punched and kicked Nicole Short and then the officers
5		drew their batons and their sprays? So again, it
6		appears at this stage the information was still that
7		subject aggressor, police responding.
8	Α.	Still part of that original narrative.
9	Q.	And then:
10		" believed that some of the officers struck the
11		now-deceased with their batons. A struggle then ensued,
12		and the now-deceased was eventually taken to the ground
13		where he was handcuffed~"
14		And leg restraints were applied:
15		"About 0730 hrs still on the ground [he]
16		lost consciousness. An ambulance was summoned and the
17		officers attempted CPR. He was thereafter conveyed by
18		ambulance to Kirkcaldy Victoria Hospital where medical
19		staff continued to treat him, however at 0904 hrs life
20		was pronounced extinct."
21		And that is essentially an update on information you
22		had presumably now gathered in
23	А.	Yes.
24	Q.	as part of the PIRC investigation. So on the next
25		page, page 3, the purpose of the interview is set out.

Would this document have been made available to you 2 prior to going to interview Craig Walker? 3 Α. Yes. 4 To give you the opportunity read through it? 5 Α. Yes. Q. It says here: 6 7 "To carry out a planned and structured interview of the police witness to achieve a detailed account of 8 9 their movements, intentions and actions leading up to, 10 during and immediately after contact with Sheku Bayoh~... Additionally, to obtain details of the 11 12 post-incident process and what discussion, if any, was 13 held between the officers regarding the incident. To 14 obtain details of briefings and other information 15 provided to the officers by Federation Staff and senior officers of Police Scotland." 16 17 So it would appear that the purpose of the interview was to find out about the movements of the officers and 18 I think at that stage you had not had any initial 19 20 accounts, so was that still unclear to PIRC at that 21 time --22 A. Yes. Q. -- what the initial movements had been? 23 24 Α. Yes. 25 Q. Then to look at the intentions of the officers, what was

- 1 your understanding of that word?
- 2 A. Sorry, where was that?
- Q. On the second line in the middle the purpose of the
- 4 interview:
- 5 "To carry a planned and structured interview of the
- 6 police witness to achieve a detailed account of their
- 7 movements, intentions~..."
- 8 A. I would take that to mean that they were considering
- 9 what they were attending, maybe listening to radio
- 10 messages as they approached it, did they have some sort
- of intended plan of action in response to whatever they
- 12 saw when they arrived.
- Q. So what was going on in their minds?
- 14 A. What was going on in their heads, what they were
- balancing up: what is my alternatives here as
- I approach, could it be A, B, C or D or anything else?
- 17 Q. Looking at alternative options --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- and considering one rather than the other?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Then their actions themselves. So the consequences of
- 22 those movements and intentions would be looking at the
- 23 actions of the officers?
- 24 A. Yes, and what they actually did when they arrive in
- 25 response to what they saw.

- 1 Q. On this date were PIRC still unclear as to what actions
  2 had been taken by individual officers?
- A. I think generally speaking, yes. I think by that time
  there would have been some eyewitness evidence and
  potentially other material available at the time -I don't think it mentions it there -- as regards CCTV
  and other footage and, as I say, descriptions of actions
  of officers.
- 9 Q. So would you, in the purpose of the interview, expect to
  10 find details of things like CCTV that was available or
  11 statements, significant statements that were available
  12 or comments that had been made or Airwaves or STORM
  13 records; would you expect any of that in the purpose?

- A. Certainly the interviewing officers to be aware of anything specific that may impact on the statement and the truth of what they are actually being told.
- Q. Were you given -- was the expectation that in advance of this interview you would go and identify significant evidence that you should be aware of before you interviewed PC Walker?
- A. Yes. I don't know the specifics of that but I would -anybody should be armed with all the relevant
  information to the task in hand, which -- that is
  a significant task, as regards getting the full account
  from these individual officers. But I don't know to

what extent that was done, I have no recollection of

2 that. Was it your normal practice to go and read significant 3 Q. 4 evidence or look at CCTV footage --5 Yes, absolutely. Again, and maybe a -- from Α. a description of a lesser-type incident that if you had 6 7 CCTV or if you had accounts from independent witnesses then you would be completely au fait with that and you 8 9 would look at the CCTV, you would read these accounts, and you would frame in your mind all the various 10 different versions of different parts of the incident, 11 12 if that was the case. 13 Was that part of your normal preparation --Q. 14 Yes. Α. 15 -- in advance of an interview? Q. 16 Α. Yes. So in the period between 2 June and 4 June when you 17 Q. 18 actually took Craig Walker's statement, would you have 19 spent some of that time at least preparing for the 20 interview? 21 Α. Certainly beforehand, yes, absolutely. 22 Then it goes on to say: Q. "Additionally, to obtain details of the 23 post-incident process and what discussion ... was held 24 between the officers~..." 25

1		What was that a reference to?
2	Α.	Basically after the incident when during the course
3		of returning or having returned to the office, accounts
4		of that activity and what their knowledge of the process
5		that occurred immediately after the incident involving
6		all the Police Scotland staff that were managing and
7		assisting with the incident.
8	Q.	We heard yesterday when I asked you to look at a number
9		of documents at the beginning of your evidence about
10		conferring
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	and warnings in relation to that. Would that have
13		covered any possible conferring between officers?
14	Α.	Yes, well, you would elicit from then basically what
15		happened during the period from whatever time you
16		returned to the office until you left to go home and
17		fill in all those blanks and give their account of what
18		happened and any significant discussions or actions.
19	Q.	Then finally:
20		"To obtain details of briefings and other
21		information provided by Federation Staff and senior
22		officers~"
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	As part of this, did you consider for example
25		a statement by Amanda Givan, who was the Federation rep,

- 1 who had -- I think I asked you to comment on some of
- 2 that yesterday, about the status of the officers and
- 3 whether that has been clarified. So again, did you
- 4 familiarise yourself with statements from Federation
- 5 reps?
- A. We would have done. I can't remember when she was
- 7 interviewed, whether she was interviewed before or after
- 8 that. I anticipate it was before but I would have done,
- 9 that would have been significant as well. Anybody that
- is feeding into -- that had contact with these officers,
- 11 that may have relevant information that we should be
- aware of just to assure us, as much as possible, that
- 13 the account we are getting is accurate and honest.
- Q. Then it recognises the situation where it may appear
- an officer incriminates himself during that
- 16 statement-giving --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- and gives direction on what to do in the situation.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And then initially you were to request the witness to
- 21 verbally recall their recollection of events prior to
- 22 noting the statement?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Is that the process that you followed with
- 25 Constable Walker?

- 1 A. Yes. Although it was slightly different with him due to
- 2 his actions at the beginning of that.
- Q. Did he give you a self-penned statement?
- 4 A. He did, yes.
- 5 Q. So when you gave you that -- we have heard evidence from
- 6 Constable Walker that he prepared a statement and gave
- 7 it to you at the outset. Did you have an opportunity to
- 8 read that statement?
- 9 A. I am sure I did before we started, yes, and then it was
- I think that was passed on to the management team.
- 11 Q. The next page is essentially a list of points in
- 12 relation to the background of the officer, are these
- points that the strategy is designed to get out of the
- officer as well?
- 15 A. Yes, these are specific unique information to them as
- far as their own police numbers, and specific training
- 17 dates, location, work and current duties.
- 18 Q. Then on page 5 a number of points regarding the
- 19 description of the officer. Again, generic questions
- that can be asked of each officer?
- 21 A. Yes, but still important in their own right,
- 22 particularly for independent witnesses who are
- 23 describing actions of specific officers.
- Q. Weight is not included in that strategy?
- A. No, but build is but yeah -- no, it's not.

Q. Page 6 it says "Introduction": 1 2 "Ask the officer to provide, in their own words, details of their duty on Sunday 3 May~... If necessary, 3 4 ask the following questions for clarity if the officer 5 does not provide such information." And we can see a number of questions there focused 6 towards the shift, the office they were working from, 7 when they got to work, the duties they were doing and 8 9 just general questions that would allow you to identify 10 where they were and what they were doing that day? Yes, just a kind of painting a picture of the build up 11 Α. 12 to it. 13 And then underneath that there is "Muster", we have Q. 14 heard evidence from the officers about a muster, and 15 again you are trying to find out who attended, who 16 carried out the muster, what supervisors were present. So at that stage you didn't have any of that information 17 available to you, or were you simply using this as a way 18 19 of --I don't know, they may have already acquired statements 20 Α. 21 from supervisors who were not directly involved in the 22 incident which may have filled the gaps with some of that information. I don't know at what stage they would 23 have been taken or followed up. 24

Then page 7, "Incident attendance". You were to ask the

25

Q.

- officers details of their attendance at the incident,
- and it covers the topics of knowledge of the locus and
- 3 knowledge of the incident. And information that they
- 4 were sent and location and suchlike?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Then page 8 is about arrival at the locus, so
- 7 essentially this is going through the events of 3 May in
- 8 chronological order?
- 9 A. Correct, without -- you know, obviously on occasions
- some of that information might be missed in a statement
- if it wasn't listed initially as a specific question to
- 12 ask.
- Q. So it may be that with individual witnesses you will
- 14 have known some of the information or some of the
- answers to the questions but this was put down to be
- 16 thorough to ask all the questions that they wanted you
- 17 to cover?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. There is also reference on page 8 to a map, towards the
- 20 bottom. And we have seen copies of maps that officers
- 21 drew on to identify their location at Hayfield Road; is
- that the maps that were used?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Were you given copies of those use as part of the
- 25 strategy?

- 1 A. Yes, I used that during the interview.
- 2 Q. Some of the questions about arrival do ask about when
- 3 Mr Bayoh was first seen, was he in possession of
- 4 anything, a knife, where was it, and questions of that
- 5 sort.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Then on the next page, page 9, it asks about initial
- 8 dealings with the deceased, and this is primarily
- 9 focused about what the officers did, what the officers
- said, and what the officers heard.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Page 10, "Arrest and restraint". Again, the focus is on
- what the officers did, what other officers did, what
- 14 they may have seen and how Mr Bayoh reacted --
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. -- to those steps. And then the next page, page 11, it
- deals with post-arrest and medical care. And then it
- goes on to the post-incident procedures and other
- 19 ancillary details to be obtained.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Can we look at pages 9 and 10. We have heard evidence
- 22 at the Inquiry that it is necessary -- officers, if they
- 23 use force during the course of their duties, that they
- have to justify that use of force. That is an important
- 25 part of their obligations as officers?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. You agree?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. You agree with that. And that as part of that
- 5 justification, they have to provide that in relation to
- 6 every single use of force that they have adopted?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. So if -- I think an example was given in evidence, if
- 9 someone is struck three times with a baton, that officer
- 10 has to justify each individual strike of that baton;
- 11 that is correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And we have been given evidence on the Inquiry that
- every use of force to be legal has to be necessary, it
- has to be reasonable, and the officer has to use the
- absolute minimum level of force?
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. We have also heard about preclusion, it is important
- 19 that officers consider other maybe less forceful
- 20 options?
- 21 A. Tactical options, yes.
- Q. They either have to try them and they fail so they
- 23 escalate or they have to take the view, based on their
- 24 experience, their knowledge and their training that that
- is not worth trying. I would like to know in relation

to this witness strategy, because I have read through

it, there don't appear to be any questions at all about

inviting officers to justify the use of force, and

I wondered if that was something that was obvious to you

5

on the day?

- I think once you got to that point in the statement that 6 Α. would be -- certainly you would be progressing on 7 certain points in relation to that, that would just be 8 9 a natural progression of part of the evidence you are 10 getting from that individual. I don't think you could ever have a position where you have every question that 11 12 you need answered because one thing leads to another on 13 most occasions when you are interviewing witnesses. So 14 this was a guide that was to provide an initial standard 15 to make sure that we got -- I take your point on, you know, the justification for that, and you may consider 16 17 that the absence of that is significant but certainly 18 that is something that I would be asking during the 19 course of the interview if that was -- it got to that 20 point, that somebody was describing an incident or part 21 of that incident where force was being used. Because 22 that is the crux, the major crux of the account you are getting. 23
- Q. So if the use of force is the major crux, would it be your normal practice to ask questions like: why did you

- think it was necessary to use that force at that time?
- 2 A. Why did you preclude the other options? How quickly did
- 3 you go through that process of considering the extent of
- 4 danger that you faced that you went from option one to
- 5 option four, for instance, straight away? And they
- 6 should be able to justify that.
- 7 Q. We have heard evidence about a SOP that the police use
- 8 which has profile defender behaviour categorised at that
- 9 time, and also at that time had a reasonable officer
- 10 response categorised with level five being lethal force?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Or deadly force. So would it have been your practice to
- ask questions about: why did you use that level of
- 14 force, was there not another option available, why did
- 15 you not de-escalate that type of thing?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Any of those answers given to those questions would have
- been noted down in the statement?
- 19 A. Would have been incorporated into the statement.
- Q. As I looked through this strategy, the other area that
- 21 appeared to be absent was any questions in relation to
- the impact of race. There is no reference at all to
- race in the witness strategy?
- A. No, there is not.
- 25 Q. You obviously explained to us yesterday about keeping

1 an open mind, and I am wondering to what extent you were able to both keep an open mind yet not ask any questions 2 3 about race in the statement taking. If you are not 4 asking any questions about it, is that reflective of 5 truly keeping an open mind about the question of race?

6

7

8

9

10

11

- I said to you my belief is that personally I have kept Α. an open mind during that. Again, it's -- you know it's an issue raised that is not incorporated within that, I don't know if anything was asked at any of the interviews in relation to that. You may be aware of that already. But ...
- 12 Q. I am really just asking about the witness interview 13 strategy at the moment. Do you think that might have been of use to have some strategy or some questions 15 prepared and available for you as the investigator taking a statement, to have a page perhaps about 16 17 possible questions that could be asked in relation to 18 race?
- 19 There may be a reason why that specific question is not Α. 20 there but I am not aware of that.
- 21 Q. There was no questions, as far as I can see, about racial discrimination or mindset in relation to race at 22 all. Do you remember being encouraged to ask any 23 questions about that? 24
- 25 No, I don't have any recollection of that.

1	Q.	Were you generally encouraged to ask additional
2		questions and prepare additional pages for the witness
3		interview strategy? Would it have been within your
4		power to maybe add in another page about questions to do
5		with use of force and justification or racial
6		discrimination?
7	Α.	I think if there was something obvious that was
8		considered absent by the individuals that were going to
9		conduct that interview, then that conversation would
10		probably take place prior to the interview.
11	Q.	Certainly there were no questions about intention or use
12		of force and mindset in the strategy. Not all officers
13		are as experienced as you are, Mr Harrower, do you think
14		that perhaps even less experienced investigators may
15		benefit from a more fulsome strategy?
16	A.	They could do, yes.
17	Q.	We have heard we have statements from a Ross Stewart
18		and a Brian Dodd, I think we have mentioned
19	A.	Brian already.
20	Q.	at least Brian Dodd before. Ross Stewart is
21		an investigator for PIRC, he interviewed
22		Sergeant Maxwell who was the acting sergeant for the
23		response team on 3 May. He said:
24		"I do not recall considering specifically asking
25		Sergeant Maxwell why he took a particular course of

action. I do not recall being encouraged to ask why." 1 So it doesn't appear that Investigator Stewart 2 considered asking questions about justification for use 3 of force or intention in relation to use of force. Then 4 5 Brian Dodd, who took a statement from PC Tomlinson, says 6 in his statement: 7 "To my knowledge PIRC investigators were not encouraged to add their own questions to the witness 8 9 interview strategy prior to or during the interview or 10 encouraged to ask why officers took certain decisions or actions." 11 Do you have any -- do you want to comment on that 12 13 about the lack of encouragement? A. Probably what I had said already, that during the course 14 15 of the interview there is different strands will come out and you -- I would expect anyone with any 16 17 investigative experience at all to then expand on that and ask the appropriate questions. And that may not fit 18 anywhere within that original strategy, but you know the 19 20 expectation is that you would follow that through and 21 record the answers to these questions. 22 Certainly? Q. It is not specific, you know, follow that and nothing 23 Α. else. That is definitely not what it is. 24 Q. Mr Dodd does seem to say investigators were not 25

- 1 encouraged to add their own questions. Do you think
- 2 some investigators felt they were constrained by the
- 3 strategy?
- 4 A. I wouldn't say so, no.
- 5 Q. That wasn't your experience?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. So if you had felt it appropriate, you have said normal
- 8 practice would be to ask for justification of use of
- 9 force. If you had felt it appropriate you could have
- 10 asked questions about racial -- possible racial
- 11 discrimination or the mindset of officers in relation to
- race, if you had wished to do so?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. I would like to move on and ask you about expert
- 15 witnesses. You have spoken in your statement about part
- of the PIRC investigation involving the need to go to
- 17 experts, mainly medical or forensic experts --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- to provide additional opinion and evidence available
- for PIRC?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. I think you were involved to some extent in instructing
- or being involved in that process of instructing
- 24 experts?
- 25 A. Yes, and more the preparation and delivery in some

- 1 fashion of packages.
- 2 Q. I think you had prepared, at least for Dr Payne-James
- 3 and a number of other witnesses such as Dr Karch, what
- 4 was called an expert witness package?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Can you explain to people what an expert witness
- 7 package, what that was?
- 8 A. From memory it was -- you would have a summary of the
- 9 incident within that, any reference to any other
- 10 evidence which built the picture for the period of time.
- 11 You would outline what you were looking for them to
- 12 achieve, what their expertise was required for, and
- there would be initial contact with these individuals to
- 14 ascertain whether they were appropriate for that
- 15 function and then a decision would be taken at a much
- higher level whether they would be used and that would
- include contractual arrangements and -- to inform that
- 18 final decision. And then there would be -- a covering
- 19 letter went with the packages to -- again, just
- 20 outlining in summary fashion what they were being
- 21 requested to do and agreeing to their contractual
- 22 arrangements and specifying what information we were
- hoping they would provide.
- 24 Q. Who was responsible for selecting the evidence that
- would build that picture?

- 1 A. I was involved in that partly but I think -- I think
- 2 Billy Little and John McSporran, it would be
- 3 a collective involvement in that and then a final sign
- 4 off the completed document, that they were satisfied
- 5 with the content and the presentation of it.
- 6 Q. You have given some detail in your Inquiry statement
- about the issue that arose with Ashley Wyse's statement,
- 8 I think a paragraph had been --
- 9 A. I believe so, there was --
- 10 Q. -- omitted. As I understand your Inquiry statement,
- a typist had omitted an important paragraph from that.
- I am interested in the sort of quality assurance process
- in place in relation to the expert witness package. So
- 14 was there somebody checking that everything -- all the
- information being given to the experts was complete?
- Beyond yourself, was there anyone that was helping with
- that or managing that process?
- 18 A. Yes, there was -- I am not 100% but I think that would
- 19 have fallen between the lead investigator and their
- deputy, the final sign off on the packages.
- 21 Q. Would you expect the lead investigator or their deputy
- 22 to be checking that individual statements were complete?
- 23 A. Possibly, I don't think they would read through and
- 24 check word-for-word. There was an expectation that the
- 25 statements -- when they are taken, most of them are in

- handwritten form. They will then be typed and then they
  are proof-read by the investigators that are taking
  them, and that is a core part of that process. So the
  expectation would be that it is correct at that stage,
  so if a package was getting put together, I don't think
  I would be anticipating the lead investigator would be
  reading every statement and comparing that with the
- 9 Q. So in terms of that comparison between the handwritten
  10 version and the typed version, would it be the
  11 individual investigator who took that statement that you
  12 would expect to carry out that --

other version of it.

8

19

20

- A. Yes, more often than not the written statements would be dictated, they would be typed by administration staff and then they would be checked by the investigator that took it and confirmed and if there was any discrepancies, spelling mistakes, anything that was missing, that would go back and get taken care of.
  - Q. If the investigator dictates the content of a statement that he or she has taken, but for some reason omits a paragraph, how would the typist know?
- 22 A. They wouldn't.
- Q. They wouldn't?
- A. They will type what they get, and when it comes back the written version should be getting checked against the

- 1 typed version.
- 2 Q. So again, would that go back to the original
- 3 investigator to do that process of checking?
- 4 A. On most occasions but there will be occasions when they
- 5 are absent and whatever, so -- but somebody else, it
- should be done in every case by someone.
- 7 Q. What if the investigator makes a mistake or
- 8 intentionally leaves out some key information, how would
- 9 that be checked and corrected before use was made of the
- 10 statement?
- 11 A. If the written version was not the same as the typed
- 12 version?
- 13 Q. Yes.
- 14 A. It's hard to say, it might not be corrected.
- 15 Q. Is that -- does that remain the position today?
- 16 A. I don't know exactly how the Ashley Wyse situation came
- about and was subsequently identified. I can't --
- I can't recall what the specifics of that was.
- 19 Q. You know it was identified. Did all the experts then
- 20 receive a fresh copy of the typed version?
- 21 A. I don't remember. I am not sure.
- 22 Q. Presumably you would have expected that to be corrected
- for the experts?
- 24 A. Yes, I don't recollect when that omission was
- 25 identified. So I don't know if that -- the whole

- 1 process is gone through and their reports had been
- 2 submitted, I don't remember at what the stage that was
- 3 identified and what the subsequent actions to resolve
- 4 that were.
- 5 Q. Can I ask you if you had any training, is it common for
- 6 investigators for involved in instructing experts and
- 7 pulling together an expert witness package?
- 8 A. No, it's not. It's not common. It doesn't happen --
- 9 again, it is very critical significant incidents where
- 10 you would go to that length to acquire that sort of
- 11 evidence. Obviously more in the police world it would
- be the likes of murder investigations, other serious --
- where you would acquire that type of evidence, obviously
- 14 different for us, different types of investigations, but
- 15 still high level.
- Q. When you -- as a PIRC investigator, prior to 3 May 2015,
- had you been involved in instructing experts in
- investigations?
- 19 A. I don't think so, no.
- Q. Had you received any training in PIRC about instructing
- 21 an expert in the proper way of doing that?
- 22 A. No.
- Q. Have you had any training since?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. As --

- 1 A. I don't know if there is a defined way of doing that and
- 2 whether there is such a thing as a course in relation to
- 3 that, I would doubt it to be honest. I am certainly not
- 4 aware of any specific focused training on that subject
- 5 matter.
- Q. You are not aware of any?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. So you have never had anything like that with the
- 9 police?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. As a police officer did you have to get involved with
- instructing experts?
- 13 A. I don't recall ever doing that in my -- in the police
- 14 world.
- Q. All right. Do you know when -- who was it that would
- identify the expert as suitable, someone who would have
- 17 the correct qualifications and experience, who would
- meet the criteria that he would or she would be able to
- assist the PIRC investigation?
- 20 A. I certainly did some of that during the early stages of
- 21 that process and was actioned to do that by the lead
- investigators.
- 23 Q. How did you find that given had you not had any training
- or real experience in instructing experts?
- 25 A. I went to other organisations who did, for instance the

- 1 College of Policing, and who hold databases on experts
- 2 in different -- a lot of different fields, and who have
- done that on behalf of police forces and other agencies
- 4 over a period.
- 5 Q. Did you give them a list of criteria or qualifications
- or experience that you were looking to be identified?
- 7 A. Yes, I think it was subject areas, the types of experts
- 8 for specific things.
- 9 Q. Mainly the subject area?
- 10 A. Yes, like restraint and under the influence of drugs,
- 11 that type of thing.
- 12 Q. Right.
- 13 A. So we got a number of responses back for -- as I say,
- I don't know how many subject headings there were and
- then the backgrounds of these individuals were passed up
- the chain to consider these and I think ultimately they
- 17 would go to Crown for a definitive on whether they would
- or would not be instructed.
- 19 Q. Did you go through a process where you looked at the
- information you had been sent, say by the College of
- 21 Policing, and confirm that that expert or that
- 22 individual met the criteria that PIRC --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. I think you were involved in preparing an expert witness
- 25 package for Dr Karch?

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you look at his criteria and his qualifications and
- 3 experience?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. Any reason why?
- 6 A. Well, I did once I saw -- initially -- not initially,
- 7 I think it may have been John McSporran that had
- 8 identified his apparent specialism in a certain area and
- 9 then we -- I think I was the first person to contact him
- 10 to establish and get some background on where his
- specialist area was and I had a number of communications
- 12 with him.
- Q. What was your understanding of his specialist area?
- 14 A. I think it was in relation to the effects of ... the
- name's just escaped me~... alpha-PVP.
- Q. We have heard some evidence about toxicology and about
- 17 substances. Was it your view that Dr Karch had
- 18 expertise in toxicology or understanding illicit
- 19 substances?
- 20 A. I didn't have an in-depth -- as I say, initially the
- 21 research that identified him, I wasn't involved in doing
- 22 that but then progressed to contacting him and then
- subsequently I think he was authorised by Crown as
- an expert witness, and then a package was sent to him in
- 25 the manner I described in the statement.

```
As part of that, did you ask him for a CV --
 1
         Q.
 2
         Α.
             Yes.
             -- or to provide information about his qualifications?
 3
         Q.
 4
         Α.
             I am sure I did, yes.
         Q. Can I ask you about a letter that was sent from the
 5
             Commissioner, Kate Frame, to Aamer Anwar on
 6
             9 October 2015, this is PIRC 01849. I am interested in
 7
             page 6. So this is a letter from the Commissioner to
 8
 9
             the solicitor who was representing the family.
10
         Α.
             Yes.
11
         Q.
             And:
12
                 "As you may be aware ..."
13
                 That paragraph. Do you see that?
14
             Yes.
         Α.
15
             "... in order to facilitate the examination by your
         Q.
             expert, Dr Nat Cary, of histology and other samples,
16
17
             a PIRC investigator travelled to Dr Cary's home with the
             samples and remained while he examined them. Dr Cary
18
19
             asked who the experts chosen by Crown were and was
20
             informed that they were Dr Karch and Dr Payne-James.
21
             Dr Cary expressed his professional regard for the
22
             significant expertise of both persons, considering
23
             Dr Karch to be one of the most eminent and expert
```

practitioners in the world in the field of

cardiopathology."

24

- Can I ask you first of all, was it you that went to
- 2 take samples to Dr Cary?
- 3 A. It was, yes.
- 4 Q. And he was an expert -- we have heard evidence from
- 5 Dr Cary and he was an expert that was originally
- 6 contacted by Aamer Anwar & Co?
- 7 A. Yes, I am aware of that.
- 8 Q. You were then the investigator who travelled to
- 9 Dr Cary's home with samples?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Where it says there the investigator, namely, you:
- "... remained while he examined them."
- So remained there while Dr Cary examined them. Did
- 14 you remain there while Dr Cary examined them?
- 15 A. No.
- Q. How is it that the Commissioner has come to write that
- in this letter to Aamer Anwar?
- 18 A. I don't know.
- 19 Q. Did you have a conversation with the Commissioner about
- 20 this?
- 21 A. Not to my recollection, no.
- Q. Did you provide any written documentation or other
- 23 communication to the Commissioner about the situation
- 24 with Dr Cary and the delivery of the samples.
- 25 A. I have no recollection of doing that, no.

- Q. So, as far as you are aware, where did that information come from, that the Commissioner has put in this letter?
- I don't know. There is obviously an inference within 3 Α. 4 that that I have had a discussion with Dr Cary regarding 5 other experts. I have no recollection of that. I do -the only thing I remember is going there, I remember 6 7 meeting him and possibly his wife, we were in the hallway of the house somewhere, and I think he had his 8 9 own room where he carried out examinations within the 10 premises there. I have no recollection and I would be surprised if I specifically mentioned experts names to 11 12 him. I'm not discounting that that happened but I would 13 think that unlikely. I certainly have no recollection
- Q. So on this second part of that paragraph, do you remember Dr Cary asking you who the experts chosen by the Crown were?

Dr Karch's eminence in that field.

of doing that whatsoever, or the references to

14

15

A. No. What I have said to you is all I can remember about
that visit. Obviously this information has come from
somewhere, it could only come from -- from that visit,
I would have thought, and anything that was fed back.
But I honestly cannot remember discussing -- I was there
for a purpose which was to deposit that stuff with
Dr Cary, allow him to do his examination and then return

1 with the same items. 2 So in relation to that paragraph in the letter by Q. the Commissioner, do you have any recollection about 3 4 the circumstances that are described in that paragraph? 5 No, other than attending Dr Cary's home. If discussions took place, sorry, I just do not recall that. As I say, 6 7 I am not discounting it happened but I cannot give any more information or detail on that. 8 Were you with anybody else that day? 9 Q. 10 Α. No. Thank you. Can I ask you to look at PIRC 01858, please. 11 Q. 12 This is a letter from Aamer Anwar to PIRC for the attention of the Commissioner, Kate Frame, which sets 13 14 out a number of concerns about the selection of Dr Karch 15 as an expert witness. So this letter is dated 6 November 2015. The previous letter I just asked you 16 17 about was 9 October 2015. So this is the following month that this letter is written with reference to 18 Dr Cary's alleged endorsement of Dr Karch and he makes 19 20 reference to the letter of 9 October that we have just 21 looked at. Mr Aamer Anwar advises the Commissioner that 22 Dr Cary -- and the quotation in the letter says Dr Cary 23 24 is said to say:

"I did not lend any support to the instruction of

either Dr Payne-James or Dr Karch. It is extremely 1 disappointing if this facilitation is now being used as 2 3 a means of manufacturing my implied support for the instruction of Dr Karch." 4 5 Were you aware that there had been subsequent correspondence between Mr Anwar and the Commissioner in 6 7 relation to the issue of Dr -- either Dr Karch or Dr Cary? 8 I think the only thing I had any memory of was reference 9 Α. 10 made to my visit and not being there for a period of 11 time. 12 Q. Did the Commissioner or anyone else in PIRC come back to 13 you about this matter round about the November of that year, to ask you further questions about --14 15 Α. No, I don't have any recollection of that, no. I don't know what the timeline here is in relation to when 16 17 Dr Karch was initially identified, and when the visit to Dr Cary's was. I don't recall what that was and how 18 relevant that is. 19 Q. I can take you through your statement if you wish but 20 21 I don't think the date so much --22 Α. No --Q. -- makes any difference. The letter in October from the 23 Commissioner was 9 October and that is -- the paragraph 24 that she had written in relation to the matter regarding 25

1 Dr Cary and Dr Karch was dated 9 October. I am going to move on to another passage of evidence 2 now. I wonder if that might be an appropriate time for 3 4 the break. 5 LORD BRACADALE: We will take a 15-minute break. 6 (3.01 pm)7 (A short break) (3.20 pm)8 9 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 10 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I would like to move on to another 11 topic now, Mr Harrower. We have heard from you that 12 PIRC were from the very outset investigating the events 13 at Hayfield Road and the death of Mr Bayoh, the cause of 14 his death, and from the beginning that was part of the 15 terms of reference from the Crown --16 A. Yes. Q. -- to PIRC. In terms of a PIRC investigation where 17 18 there is an unascertained death and you are 19 investigating the cause of that death as part of your 20 investigation, do you have a certain amount of discretion as to how -- the best way to go about that 21 22 investigation, say into cause of death? A. Yes, depending on what those terms of reference actually 23 are, and then your investigation would expand out where 24 25 you see fit, if there was need for consultation with

- Crown at some stage where it was a significant expansion
  of that then it would be appropriate to correspond with
- 3 them and consult with them in relation to that.
- Q. I asked a number of the senior police officers about
  their approach to investigating unexplained death, and
  we heard mention of something called the murder manual
  and how they develop hypotheses. Do PIRC investigators
  take a similar approach when they are investigating
  an unexplained death?
- 10 A. I would say so, I mean we certainly have considerations
  11 or hypotheses about what potentially at the outset would
  12 be the relevant matters to consider, and conduct your
  13 enquiries to negate any of these as it progresses.

14

15

16

17

- Q. We have heard from Pat Campbell about -- he started thinking about hypotheses on the way to Kirkcaldy that day and we have heard from Lesley Boal about the type of hypotheses she had in her mind that she would be considering.
- A. Yes, and I think he mentioned that we had discussed some of these as well at an early stage.
- Q. I think as I understand this method, or this use of
  hypotheses, they are developed over a period of time,
  and investigated, and then once -- where there is no
  evidence to support a hypothesis, then it can be
  eliminated. But you have to wait until you can be sure

2 Α. Yes. Would you agree with that --3 Q. 4 Α. Yes. 5 -- type of approach? Can I then ask you about some of Q. the evidence we have heard about the type of hypotheses 6 7 that the police may have considered in relation to the events of 3 May, and just see if PIRC, the PIRC 8 investigation mirrored that approach. 9 10 Lesley Boal, for example, gave evidence to the Inquiry that potentially there may have been criminality 11 12 on the part of the police officers, and that could have 13 been one of the hypotheses that was investigated, into 14 the cause of death? 15 Α. Yes. There may have been an underlying medical condition that 16 Q. maybe caused or contributed to Mr Bayoh's death? 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 And a way of investigating that type of thing would be Q. 20 to recover GP records, maybe take information from the family about Mr Bayoh's health. Do you agree with that? 21 22 Α. Yes. Q. She talked about race as a possibility: 23 24 "... it being in the back of your mind when you are thinking about all the possibilities. In terms of 25

that there is no evidence to support it?

hypotheses one would have been that the male had been treated differently because he was a black male."

Would you agree with that hypothesis?

- A. That wasn't one of my considerations initially, as I say
  I was keeping an open mind to that but at the forefront
  was what you have mentioned already, the fact that he
  may have sustained an injury immediately prior to his
  interaction with the police, we were aware that he was
  involved in~... So that was a consideration that there
  may have been criminal conduct by others prior to that,
  at any of these locations that we had previously
  mentioned that were coming under the responsibility of
  Police Scotland at that time. There was excessive use
  of force at the -- in Hayfield Road itself, and that
  maybe even combined with one of -- the underlying
  medical conditions considerations that you have
  mentioned.
  - Q. As I understand the use of hypotheses, it is considering all the possibilities that may have caused the death of Mr Bayoh, not fixing on any particular one, not favouring any particular one, but keeping an open mind about all of them, and investigating each possible hypothesis, seeing if there is evidence to support it.

    If ultimately there is no evidence, that can be eliminated. Is that a fair summary?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. So you would have been keeping an open mind about all of
- 3 the hypotheses --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. -- that were possibilities, so criminality on the part
- of the police, excessive use of force in Hayfield Road,
- 7 a previous assault, a medical condition?
- 8 A. Yes, drugs.
- 9 Q. Drink and drugs could have been a factor?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Equally, as Ms Boal has said, is one of the things you
- 12 would keep an open mind about that he -- Mr Bayoh had
- perhaps been treated differently because he was a black
- 14 male, and that -- when I say treated differently,
- 15 treated differently by the officers, and that the
- actions taken by them were because he was black? Was
- that a hypothesis that you considered?
- 18 A. That wasn't at the forefront of my mind at the time, as
- I say but --
- Q. Was it at the back of your mind?
- 21 A. -- really I was open minded to that. But considering
- 22 you know the evidence that was available, the
- 23 information at the time, and that there were these
- 24 previous incidents in the lead-up to it which suggested
- 25 that is probably more likely as a consideration at that

time so they were higher on the list, I would say, as

2 a consideration. Were you categorising in terms of likelihood already --3 Q. 4 Α. In my mind, yes. 5 In your mind. Q. And just, you know -- and that would be reassessed at 6 Α. 7 different stages as additional information came in and obviously later in the Inquiry there was still was 8 9 consideration and evidence to support that drugs had 10 been taken at some time, so that would remain a higher --11 12 Q. In carrying out that process of categorisation and 13 considering some more likely than others, did that have 14 an impact on you keeping an open mind? Did that start 15 to close down, perhaps --16 No, I wouldn't say so. Α. -- your mind? I think you have given us a lot of 17 Q. 18 information in your second statement and without going 19 through all of the paragraphs I think at paragraph 209 20 you say you can't be positive but you don't believe PIRC 21 had ever considered the issue of race in an investigation before 3 May 2015. 208: 22 "Prior to 3 May~..." 23 24 You say: "... I had no experience of an investigation of 25

a death in custody or following police contact where 1 race was a factor in the investigation. I do not recall 2 3 ever having worked in an investigation since the death 4 of Sheku Bayoh where race was a factor." 5 Α. I don't believe so, no. Do you disagree with any of that? 6 Q. 7 No, I have certainly no recollection. I would be Α. surprised if it ... 8 Thank you. Paragraph 207: 9 Q. 10 "Prior to 3 May I had no experience of an investigation of a death in custody or a death 11 12 following police contact in which the deceased was 13 someone from an ethnic minority and I have no 14 recollection of dealing with one since the death of 15 Sheku Bayoh either." Does that remain the same? 16 Yes. 17 Α. 18 Q. Yesterday you spoke about having led on three deaths in custody and I think I asked you some questions about 19 20 that. You couldn't recollect that. 21 Α. I couldn't recall exactly what they were. 22 From those answers in your statement, is it fair to say Q. that none of the three deaths in custody you had 23 investigated involved any issues of race? 24

Not to my recollection at all, no.

1	Q.	Thank you. Now, it was on 2 September 2015, perhaps we
2		can look at this, that a letter was sent from the Crown
3		to the Commissioner, Kate Frame, and that is
4		COPFS 02557. You will see this is a letter from
5		Crown Office to Kate Frame, 2 September 2015. And if we
6		move down the page, please, and if we can look at page 4
7		I think it is. It's a detailed letter. It starts:
8		"I require confirmation from the Commissioner that
9		issues of race and whether there is any evidence of
10		racial motivation is a primary focus in the PIRC
11		investigation. The investigation should examine whether
12		there is any evidence that any of the offices
13		involved"
14		I think that should say "officers":
15		" has expressed any racist views or opinions in
16		the past. In particular indicated that officers
17		from within the Fife area had been investigated for
18		texting racial slogans and that one of the officers was
19		referred to him. The family have enquired as to whether
20		any of those officers apparently involved in that
21		enquiry were in the group of officers engaged with
22		Mr Bayoh."
23		So this was a separate matter. We have heard some
24		evidence from DI Robson about a separate matter
25		regarding WhatsApp messages, and involving other

- officers who were not any of the nine officers who attended at Hayfield Road.
- Had there been any -- when you were involved as lead
  investigator or in any of your involvement with the
  investigation after that date, was there any mention of
  race by the Crown to PIRC prior to this letter, that you
- 7 are aware of?
- 8 A. Not that I am aware of, no.
- 9 Q. So up until this point, race has not been part of the
  10 written correspondence or terms of reference with the
  11 Crown, as I understand it?
- 12 A. Not to my knowledge, no.
- Q. Can you tell us then, if you know, what steps were
  taken, if any, prior to the 2 September when PIRC were
  keeping an open mind about these matters, to consider
  the aspect of race as part of investigation? So this is
  prior to that letter from the Crown.
- 18 A. I think John McSporran or Billy Little would need to
  19 comment on that. I can't give any specific answer on
  20 that.
- Q. In your role as an investigator involved in the
  investigation -- obviously you have taken statements
  from at least one officer, you took statements from
  DS Dursley, I think, and a trainer, Inspector Young -were there any discussions amongst PIRC about race and

- investigating race prior to 2 September?
- 2 A. Not to my knowledge, no.
- 3 Q. After this letter came in from the Crown on 2 September
- 4 were you aware of steps being taken to look into the
- 5 issue of race?
- 6 A. I was aware in general terms that actions were being
- 7 raised in response to this extension to the terms of
- 8 reference basically.
- 9 Q. What changes were put in place after this letter was
- 10 received from the Crown?
- 11 A. Changes as in ...?
- 12 Q. What additional steps were taken to look into the issue
- of race after this letter was received?
- 14 A. There was certainly investigation conducted in relation
- to Fife officers etc, to answer that specific point that
- 16 you have detailed there. I can't tell you exactly what
- they were.
- 18 Q. Were the investigations carried out focused on that
- 19 issue regarding Fife officers and texting and --
- 20 A. Yes, I believe so, yes.
- 21 Q. Any other expansion of the investigation to incorporate
- issues of race?
- 23 A. Not that I am aware of. But again, that is something
- that they would be able to answer specifically and in
- 25 detail, I am quite sure.

- 1 Q. Better to ask Little or McSporran.
- 2 So if I have additional questions regarding whether
- 3 discrimination was considered or the type of
- discrimination that was considered, or statements
- 5 obtained, would I be better speaking to Mr McSporran
- 6 about that?
- 7 A. I would say so, yes.
- 8 Q. In your role as an investigator were you ever tasked
- 9 with obtaining any statements --
- 10 A. Not in relation to that aspect.
- 11 Q. -- primarily in relation to race?
- 12 A. No.
- Q. Were you ever asked to seek guidance on investigating
- 14 race?
- 15 A. No.
- Q. Were you ever tasked with looking at how previous
- 17 enquiries or investigations had looked at race and
- investigated race?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. Were you ever tasked with seeking guidance from third
- 21 parties who may be able to assist in preparing
- 22 a strategy to look at race?
- A. No, I wasn't. Not personally, no.
- Q. Were you ever asked to speak to someone who maybe had
- 25 experience or lived experience in relation to

- 1 an investigation in relation to race?
- 2 A. No, I wasn't.
- 3 Q. Were you ever asked to seek guidance from anyone in
- 4 Crown Office in relation to what further investigations
- 5 the Crown may have wished PIRC to carry out in relation
- 6 to race?
- 7 A. No, I wasn't.
- 8 Q. Were you ever asked to do any sort of analysis of the
- 9 statements you had to consider the use of any racial
- 10 language or racially stereotypical language?
- 11 A. No, not personally.
- 12 Q. Sorry?
- 13 A. Not personally I wasn't, no.
- Q. Were you aware of anyone carrying out that comparison?
- 15 A. No, I don't know the full extent of what actions were
- 16 placed for -- to cover the race issues that you are
- 17 talking about. There was a lot, I am quite certain of
- that, but I don't know the specifics of all of those and
- 19 how far that extended and whether review of previous
- 20 material that we had got into the investigation.
- 21 Q. So again, is it fair to say you think perhaps
- 22 Mr McSporran or maybe Mr Mitchell would be in a better
- position to help me with that?
- A. Yes, they would.
- 25 Q. In the statement you took from Craig Walker he made

- mention as part of that about terrorist threat, the level, the threat level at that stage.
- A. Yes, I think that was one of -- I can't remember your

  terminology but basically the thoughts going through

  an officer's head before they actually arrived, and

  I think he alluded to -- that was one of the things that

  he was -- had considered prior to his arrival.
- Q. Did you consider perhaps when you were taking

  a statement from Constable Walker, consider that that

  might have been an indication of a link in his mind

  between terrorism and the fact that Mr Bayoh was black?
- 12 A. I don't recall.
- Q. Do you remember asking any questions about that or exploring that as an issue?
- 15 A. Not specifically, no.
- Q. Nowadays is there more guidance available to PIRC investigators in relation to carrying out investigations regarding race?
- 19 A. Internally or externally?
- Q. Internally, I was thinking. I will show you document
  I am interested in. PIRC 04724. And the Inquiry has
  received a copy of these guidelines, "PIRC guidelines
  for dealing with allegations of discrimination when
  undertaking investigations and complaint handling
  reviews", but I am particularly interested in the

- investigations part. The pages are numbered top
- 2 right-hand side, and my understanding is that this
- document came into existence in 2021. Have you seen
- 4 this document before?
- 5 A. I think so, yes.
- 6 Q. Have you read this document before?
- 7 A. I believe I have, yes.
- 8 Q. Have you had training in relation to the content of the
- 9 document?
- 10 A. Not that I recall.
- 11 Q. Were you -- in terms of having read through it, was that
- something you were given time to do; was there any
- discussion with fellow colleagues about the content?
- 14 A. I don't remember whether when it was circulated. I know
- of its existence but it obviously will appear on our
- internal systems for reference when required.
- Q. We have heard about documents that are available to
- 18 police officers on their internal systems, that some of
- 19 them find -- we have heard evidence that some of them
- 20 find it very difficult to carve out time to read those
- 21 documents because they are so busy on their shifts. Is
- that something that you experience in PIRC given your
- workload?
- 24 A. I don't think the volume is anywhere near what
- 25 Police Scotland have as far as procedural documents and

- standard operating procedures, there is huge numbers to

  deal with the various types of incidents.
- Q. So in terms of having access to documents and the time
  to read them, is that something that PIRC investigators
  are very comfortable with fitting in, in their day?
- A. I would say so. They are certainly readily accessible
  and invariably when a new document is created, there
  will be a communication, a circulation highlighting what
- 9 it is and where it is.
- 10 Q. Was it that circulation that gave rise to your reading this document?
- 12 A. I would think so, I don't know, I can't remember for sure.
- Q. Are you comfortable that you have read this document in its entirety?
- 16 A. I am sure I have, yes.
- Q. Do you remember when you did?
- 18 A. No, I don't.
- 20 an investigation today that involved a black man,
  21 an unexplained death perhaps, issues of possible racial
  22 discrimination or excessive use of force, would you go
  23 to these guidelines to provide you with assistance?
- A. I think we all would and refer to a variety of things, to inform the way that we approach it, I would think.

Q. Can I ask you -- I am not going to read out this entire 1 document, it is available for the Chair to consider in 2 detail, but would you look at page -- I think it is the 3 4 investigation section. Page 30. On page 2 it says 5 section 6 is conducting an investigation, and that is at page 30. I should have put a Post-It on this. It is 6 7 actually -- I think on my copy it's page 31: "Conducting an investigation or [case handling 8 review]." 9 10 Do you see that? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. This is the section which sets out -- it says here: 13 "Investigating and Review officers~..." 14 That would be someone like yourself? 15 Α. Yes. "... should have a detailed understanding of equality 16 Q. and diversity issues and an appropriate level of 17 knowledge, skills and experience to be able to apply 18 19 these guidelines and undertake effective 20 investigations~..." 21 So is the advice and guidance here that is contained 22 in section 6 designed by PIRC to provide investigators with a route map --23 Knowledge and support to do their appropriate function. 24 Α. Q. -- about undertaking an investigation which may involve 25

possible racial discrimination or race issues. Do you

2 agree with that? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. Have you found this -- I appreciate you have said you have not been involved in any investigations regarding 5 race since these guidelines came out, but having read 6 7 the document, has this guidance been easy to read, have you found it helpful? There are a number of practical 8 examples --9 10 A. Yes, it's like various -- you will go and seek these out, and read in more detail and refresh the memory from 11 12 the initial reading of it, to guide yourself and make 13 sure that you are approaching things in a proper 14 fashion. 15 Q. We see on page 31 on the screen it says: "The terms of reference for an investigation into 16 17 a death that raises issues of discrimination should explicitly refer to and address any discrimination 18 allegations raised." 19 20 And: 21 "... where no specific allegation of discrimination 22 has been made but it is apparent that discrimination may be a relevant consideration." 23 24 You have also to refer to these guidelines? Yes. 25 Α.

- Q. So it gives advice about understanding the allegation,
  conducting the investigation, using a comparator to see
  if that is of assistance. It comment on discriminatory
  language, probing accounts. Is this -- looking at that
  now, would that have been of assistance to you in 2015,
- 7 A. I think so. More than of assistance, it's a kind of direction to follow in certain instances.
- 9 Q. So if you were in a situation today, as you were on
  10 3 May 2015, would this document have been invaluable to
  11 you in deciding how to investigate?
- 12 A. It would have assisted, I think.

all of that advice?

6

13

14

15

16

17

Q. Thank you. Can I ask you about lessons learned. I have asked a number of people about learning lessons after 3 May 2015. Can we look at your second statement which is the 382 one, at paragraph 7. You are asked here about lessons learned and it says here:

"During the course of, or at the conclusion of more 18 19 complex investigations, debriefs are sometimes held. 20 This provides an opportunity to identify learning and 21 other relevant information for future investigations. 22 This involves a structured meeting with management and the investigation team involved where the key parts of 23 the investigation are discussed in detail. Any relevant 24 actions are taken forward." 25

- I am interested in this process that is adopted in
  PIRC. Can you help us understand on what occasions
  would this type of process be embarked upon, the lessons
  learned process?
- It is more often at the direction of one of the very 5 Α. senior members of staff, the director of operations 6 7 probably, in relation to the justification and need for doing that. It is not done as a matter of course, it's 8 selective, just depending on the investigation, possibly 9 10 what is established process-wise within that that has maybe caused issues, and there may be a need after that 11 12 to cascade that learning out to Police Scotland, or the 13 other -- any of the other agencies who are responsible for, to discuss that and make changes in the processes 14 15 for the future.
- Q. So this process doesn't necessarily just have to be an internal process, it can be --
- A. Not necessarily, I mean if you are going to have
  significant learning and it does involve the
  participation and taking on board from partner agencies,
  then we would do that.
- Q. In your experience have you found these exercises to be beneficial in improving practice internally or dealings with third parties?
- 25 A. Yes, both.

Q. Both. You say that that is held sometimes. Does it --1 2 you have said it depends on the investigation. Does it depend on the manager? 3 4 Α. I think it is more on the complexity and the potential 5 for learning and significant process change, that really you can't go to another similar type of investigation 6 7 without that changing in the interim period, so that that process works better. 8 9 So, as I say, it would normally come about by 10 direction from one of the senior managers, whether that may be cascaded upwards with a suggestion that that 11 12 occurs, but it is obviously involving a lot of people, 13 a lot of time, significant discussions. So, as I say, it doesn't happen for every investigation, nothing like 14 15 it. So ... 16 Then you go on to say: Q. 17 "No debrief was held in relation to the death of Mr Bayoh. This would have been a decision for senior 18 19 management in PIRC at that time. It is difficult to 20 form an opinion at this late stage on whether any 21 benefits would have been derived from this." 22 Can you think of a reason why there would not have been this debrief or --23 That was certainly from my knowledge, I don't know in my 24 Α.

absence if anything occurred, I don't think it was, but

- again probably John McSporran will be able to confirm

  that 100%. Why it didn't happen, I don't know. I can't

  give you an answer to that.
  - Q. You have said in your statement it's difficult to form an opinion on whether benefits may have -- would have been derived, but in light -- obviously we have been talking for two days now nearly, we have been going through a lot of different aspects of the investigation, and I wonder in light of that and my questions, do you think that there may have been opportunities for learning, that if there had been this exercise --
- 12 Α. Undoubtedly they were and, as I say, soon after there 13 were very significant changes and maybe that was 14 effectively a debrief at a much higher partnership level 15 that that happened, probably the top of that list of the post-incident process, I can't remember when --16 17 discussions started fairly soon, it took quite a while to actually implement those full changes but that is now 18 19 an integral part of the whole process for this type of 20 incident, and is a massive change in how these critical 21 incidents are dealt with.
- Q. This may be my ignorance but I imagine a debrief involves input from the staff who were --
- A. Yes, at every level.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

25 Q. -- involved in the investigation because that is

- 1 a positive way of really learning lessons, and improving
- 2 things from the people who lived that experience.
- 3 A. Yes, even smaller issues that collectively can make
- 4 a difference.
- 5 Q. So if there had been a lessons learned exercise or
- a debrief, can you think of a reason why the first lead
- 7 investigator on 3 May wouldn't have been included as
- 8 part of that conversation?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. I would like to ask you some -- a couple of
- 11 clarification points that arise out of your evidence
- 12 yesterday and just to cover those at the moment if you
- 13 don't mind. I didn't have a document ID number
- 14 yesterday and became little bit confused about
- a document and I said I'd stop digging, do you remember
- 16 that?
- 17 A. The different handwriting, yes.
- Q. Could you look at PIRC 04528, please. We will look at
- page 1. Alternatively we could look at ... This was
- 20 the document we had on the screen yesterday. Now, this
- 21 handwriting as I understand it comes from
- 22 Richard Casey's notebook, so it wasn't your handwriting
- 23 it was Richard Casey's handwriting. And it was
- 24 Richard Casey who was having a conversation, as
- I understand it, on Sunday, 3 May 2015 at 10 am with

1 yourself, Harrower. 2 Yes. Α. 3 And it was during this conversation that he noted the Q. 4 words, and I find it quite difficult to read there, but 5 he noted the words "political side". It is quite faint on the screen as it appears there. But do you see it 6 7 just under the Dave Green instruction and then "Political side"? 8 Yes. 9 Α. 10 Q. Do you see that there? And then there is the word "Kay?" Do you see that? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 I am wondering if you have any recollection about what Q. 14 was meant during that conversation with 15 Investigator Casey that would have prompted him to write down "political side"? 16 None whatsoever and it was mainly a one-sided 17 Α. conversation by way of updating him on the incident, 18 what the instruction was and what the intentions were as 19 20 far as staffing. Obviously those words are beside --21 I think I agree it is "Kay?" That most likely would be 22 media representative for PIRC at the time. Q. That is very helpful. So we have heard evidence from 23 an Inspector Kay, but this would have been a reference 24

to --

- 1 A. I very much doubt it was him because certainly at that
- 2 early stage it is unlikely.
- Q. Was this a person within PIRC that dealt with media?
- 4 A. Yes, at that time.
- 5 Q. At that time?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Thank you. The other thing I want to clear up with you
- is in relation to the comments you made yesterday about
- 9 Garry Sinclair.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. You talking about him being tasked to recover the
- 12 equipment and the clothing of the officers. You gave
- that as a possible explanation why he didn't turn up to
- 14 Hayfield Road until 7.20?
- 15 A. Later, yes.
- Q. 7.20. In his Inquiry statement -- we have not heard
- 17 evidence from Garry Sinclair but in his Inquiry
- 18 statement -- for those behind me copies of this will be
- 19 available in due course:
- "Recovery of the clothing, footwear and officers'
- 21 safety equipment was not my responsibility but was
- 22 a discussion that was with DSI Harrower."
- I am just wondering, because I had the impression
- 24 yesterday from yourself that the recovery of the
- 25 clothing was Garry Sinclair's responsibility?

- 1 Yes, I said to you previously that we were under the 2 impression that had taken place very early, but I think 3 once we got to the office, that that hadn't been 4 completed, I don't know if had started and we had 5 discussions with Stuart Houston as the co-ordinator regarding that. So my recollection is that basically as 6 7 part of the Hayfield Road scene, that Garry and his colleague would bring that matter to a conclusion. And 8 9 as I say, that was in combination with the CS or PAVA 10 canisters that -- the additional requests that were made in relation to them. 11
- So that was my recollection of how that unfolded at
  the time, and it was offered as a -- potentially
  an explanation of that, but his sort of complete
  involvement in that aspect, I didn't have great detail
  of that, it was just he had ownership of that, the
  Hayfield Road location.
  - Q. So as far as you were concerned he was there to help with Hayfield Road?
- A. Yes, he was going to scene manage that from the PIRC perspective in liaison with the Police Scotland scene manager.
- Q. You had spoken yesterday about a briefing at Hamilton, at your offices, on 3 May?
- 25 A. Yes.

18

- 1 Q. From memory was it 11.55 or 12 o'clock during the day
- 2 that that briefing had taken place?
- 3 A. I could give you the times in the diary.
- 4 Q. You had talked about officer -- investigators coming to
- 5 Hamilton to collect vehicles, receive the briefing, and
- 6 maybe collect equipment, I think?
- 7 A. Possibly.
- 8 Q. Possibly?
- 9 A. Additional things that the scene managers may require,
- I don't know -- because I don't think any of the on-call
- 11 staff were scene managers per se and that is why we had
- the additional ~...
- 13 What I meant to mention yesterday, when we spoke at
- 14 length about the time of response from initial call-out
- 15 to them arriving, that virtually all of the members of
- staff that were called out stayed very close to
- 17 Hamilton, apart from one, whose -- I am sure his route
- 18 would come fairly close to that on the way back. Just
- 19 to again indicate, my thoughts were there is not a huge
- amount of time lost and the benefits of doing the other
- 21 things and discussing the incident, giving them my
- 22 knowledge of that and then being able to consider that
- en route was advantageous.
- 24 Q. Thank you. I think in your statement you have spoken at
- one point about collecting production kits from PIRC's

2 That would be part of what the scene managers would have Α. at their disposal, as well as the other investigators 3 need that as well, but ... 4 We have been in the process of getting a statement from 5 Q. 6 Kate Frame, the Commissioner at the time. And in part 7 of her statement she says that: "There was some material contained in the on-call 8 kit which provided a cultural awareness of various 9 10 faiths and their related beliefs and practices." We've not had any indication from other witnesses 11 12 that an on-call kit exists or what that is. We don't 13 hold that in evidence. Is that something that you are aware of having at the time that is maybe no longer 14 15 used? 16 At that time, I am not sure. Certainly more recently we have large black hard case boxes that would be termed as 17 an on-call kit that would have those sorts of items 18 19 within. What we had at that time, I am not quite sure. I don't remember. 20 21 Do you use that sort of thing now? Q. 22 Yes, they would be in the -- either be in or would be Α. taken into whatever vehicles were getting used to go as 23 a ready-made location for, you know, the production 24 labels, bags --25

offices. Would that be the type of equipment --

- 1 Q. Preserve evidence from the scene?
- 2 A. -- statement paper, whatever else -- tape, for assisting
- 3 taping off scenes. And other materials.
- 4 Q. Thank you. I would like to ask you something about --
- 5 I had discussed this yesterday with you about the death
- 6 message --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- and the delivery of the death message by
- 9 Police Scotland officers.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. I'm wondering, obviously you were lead investigator on
- 3 May regarding the death of Mr Bayoh. And I asked you
- 13 yesterday about delivery of the death message and
- 14 whether you thought there could have been a more active
- role taken by PIRC in the delivery of that death
- message, and I think you explained timing might be
- 17 difficult to do that. But do you think as the lead
- investigator in the future you could have an opportunity
- 19 to contribute to the death message, perhaps to ensure
- 20 consistency, to ensure accuracy, about information that
- is being given to the family?
- 22 A. I don't know, I think that is a difficult one because
- 23 obviously I emphasise the need for death messages to be
- 24 passed swiftly and efficiently. But how much
- 25 information has to be in that to begin with, I don't

- 1 think -- it has to be significant, that hopefully that will be followed up with the interaction and proper 2 3 communication at an early stage thereafter. But the 4 fact that that message is passed and the family don't 5 establish that information from elsewhere, so I think that in itself negates, you know, the involvement of 6 7 PIRC in any way in that. That is -- to my mind it's a police responsibility to do that and to do it within 8 a very reasonable timeframe. 9
- 10 Q. I am going to ask you this question but I think your last answer probably answers it. Given -- looking back 11 12 now at the circumstances that existed on 3 May 2015, do 13 you think that PIRC, yourself as lead investigator, 14 should have been involved or could have assisted in 15 clarifying, identifying, what the family should and could have been told and when they were told? Do you 16 17 think that is something that PIRC could or should have been involved with? 18
  - A. I don't think so. As I say, the limited information that would be passed initially, it is basically making them aware that a family member is dead. Later on different as far as, you know, how much information is passed and at what stage and the relevance of that.
- Q. So in a sense would you rely on the FLOs to provide --
  - A. Expand on it, once it is more factual, and the

19

20

21

22

23

1	information because it just makes the situation worse
2	if, with the best of intentions, you are trying to give
3	the family more information but it transpires that that
4	is flawed, and incorrect. And you sometimes can't
5	recover from that.
6	MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Could you give me one moment
7	please. (Pause).
8	Thank you very much. That concludes my examination.
9	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. Are there any Rule 9
10	applications?
11	Mr Harrower, will you withdraw to the witness room
12	while I hear submissions, please.
13	(The witness withdrew)
14	LORD BRACADALE: Ms Mitchell.
15	Rule 9 application by MS MITCHELL
16	MS MITCHELL: My Lord, in relation to a document which my
17	learned friend looked at, PIRC 03694, this is the
18	minute, the briefing note of 3 May and the witness was
19	asked about this in particular, the section about it
20	being reported that:
21	"They could clearly see he was in possession of
22	a knife and was making his way towards them~"
23	Of course we know this not to be true, and in
24	evidence this witness said it wasn't as initially
25	reported in the early information that we had.

We know from other witnesses that the first 1 24 hours, they are called the golden hours, are the most 2 3 important of an investigation. In the early hours of the investigation this was what was being -- this was 4 5 what was understood, and the question that I would like to ask is: did he become suspicious that someone at some 6 7 point had suggested that officers had clearly seen him in possession of a knife when he in fact had no knife? 8 9 Did this cause him to investigate who said this and why? 10 And finally, had this been an Inquiry in relation to civilians and he had come across this information and 11 12 then such a change, would it have caused him to examine the issue further? 13 LORD BRACADALE: Can you say that last bit again. 14 15 MS MITCHELL: Certainly: had it been an Inquiry in relation to civilians, when he had come across evidence or he 16 17 understood the early evidence to be that a man approached holding a knife and then had come to find out 18 that wasn't the evidence, would that have caused him to 19 20 investigate further? 21 What I am seeking to do there is test whether or not there was some kind of different standard applied in 22 relation to civilians as it was in relation to the 23 officers that were there. I would respectfully submit 24 it would seem likely if police officers had heard 25

at an early stage that someone had a knife and came towards them and then, from whatever source, that story changed, that might be something that would make an investigating officer want to enquire about it more. So that is the basis of that question.

The next question I would like to ask of the witness, which I don't think was covered -- forgive me if I am wrong in this regard -- was: were you aware that it had been said that the police officers would not give a statement until the outcome of the post mortem had been done, and if so did you discuss this with the Crown representative Dave Green?

The next questions arise under the discussion that my learned friend had in respect of PIRC 04182, that is the document which sets out various questions for the police officers, the investigations. And in respect of the heading, "Arrest and restraint", what I would like to ask him is if a black man had died after being detained by officers after restraint, it would presumably be important to ask how he was restrained, which officer restrained him and to ask them to describe what they did and what they saw others do in respect of the restraint, and with reference to that document there simply are none of those questions asked.

The next and final issue relates to questions that

were asked by my learned friend in connection with Kate Frame and Dr Karch. He was asked whether or not the Commissioner or anyone else in PIRC came back to him about matters around about the November of that year to ask further questions about it, and his answer was that he did not have any recollection of that, no.

There is a document PIRC number 01856(A) and that is a letter from Kate Frame to solicitors Aamer Anwar & Co that records that Ms Frame did have a conversation with DSI Harrower about this, and sets out that there appear to have been what is described as:

"... a misinterpretation of SI Harrower's rehearsal of a conversation which in turn has led to a phrase 'eminent and expert practitioner' being erroneously referred to."

What I would like to ask him about this matter if it jogs his memory any was, first of all, why he didn't stay with the samples. My learned friend obtained from him confirmation he didn't stay with the samples but didn't ask why he didn't stay with the samples or ought he to have stayed with the samples, whether or not he told Dr Cary that he was going sightseeing in Norwich and whether or not it prompts his memory in any way if I put that part of the letter from Kate Frame to him to see whether or not that jogs his memory in relation to

1	those discussions having been had.
2	LORD BRACADALE: Could you just go back to your first point
3	and clarify it a little bit more?
4	MS MITCHELL: Yes, certainly. We have heard evidence about
5	how important it is to gather evidence at an early stage
6	in proceedings, and I think it was Detective
7	Chief Inspector Keith Hardie that said that the golden
8	hours, the first 24 hours, are your best opportunities
9	to gather evidence. The earliest briefing note we
10	appear to have on 3 May says:
11	"It was reported that, as officers drove into
12	Hayfield Road, they saw the now"
13	LORD BRACADALE: Can I just clarify, is that the briefing
14	note that he provided to his superior officers? The one
15	we were discussing this afternoon, the printed one?
16	MS MITCHELL: Yes, it's a printed one. Yes.
17	LORD BRACADALE: For the attention of the managing officer
18	or something like that?
19	MS MITCHELL: Indeed, I think so.
20	LORD BRACADALE: That is the one you are talking about?
21	MS MITCHELL: Yes. 03694 is the PIRC reference number.
22	I am just asking someone to check to ensure that is
23	the right one. The evidence of this witness was that
24	the collective had provided information which was
25	assimilated together and that collective provided

1	information which was put in the briefing note of 3 May
2	which said:
3	"It was reported that, as the officers drove into
4	Hayfield Road, they saw the now deceased coming towards
5	them as the vehicles came to a halt. They could clearly
6	see he was in possession of a knife and was making his
7	way towards them."
8	Really what I am wanting to ask is it became clear
9	to him at a later stage that that was not the case.
10	LORD BRACADALE: Is there any evidence of that?
11	MS MITCHELL: He says at 108/12:
12	" the knife had been recovered and potentially
13	that wasn't as initially reported in the early
14	information that we had."
15	So that is the evidence he gave to this Inquiry.
16	LORD BRACADALE: Did he say when he had received that
17	information?
18	MS MITCHELL: I don't think so. He just said:
19	" the knife had been recovered and potentially
20	that wasn't as initially reported in the early
21	information that we had."
22	I'm afraid he doesn't specify a time. But
23	regardless of when it was, my Lord, I would respectfully
24	submit that the question holds good, which is: if you've
25	heard that and then you hear a different story, would

1	that not cause you to make further enquiries as to why
2	you heard that first story in the golden hours and then
3	it changed to something else? Why was that story being
4	put about by someone?
5	I would respectfully submit that a question in that
6	regard would be appropriate, and also to ask: had it
7	been an enquiry in relation to civilians, would it have
8	caused him to examine it further? Those are my
9	questions, my Lord.
10	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you.
11	MS MITCHELL: I am obliged.
12	LORD BRACADALE: Ms McCall.
13	Rule 9 application by MS MCCALL
14	LORD BRACADALE: Yes, Ms McCall.
15	MS MCCALL: Sir, it is an issue that arises in this
16	afternoon's evidence, and it's the transcript at
17	page 126 to 127. There were questions from senior
18	counsel to the Inquiry that appeared to suggest that
19	PIRC investigators may have felt constrained in asking
20	anything beyond the questions set out in the interview
21	strategy. There was also a question about why the
22	officers were not asked to justify their use of force in
23	terms of that interview strategy.
24	In that context Ms Grahame made reference by way of

and an apparent quote from Mr Stewart's Inquiry 1 2 statement which is SBPI 00448, which in fact is a Rule 8 3 response. An apparent quote from that was put to the 4 witness, and the suggestion that was put was that, 5 because Mr Stewart was a less experienced investigator, 6 he may have benefitted from a more fulsome strategy 7 document. Following the quote attributed to Ross Stewart, 8 9 which is on page 124 at line 24 to page 125, line 11 of 10 the transcript, the witness was asked to comment. The issue is this, sir: the quote was presented in 11 12 the form of a single quote when in fact it comprised two 13 sentences that come from different parts of Mr Stuart's 14 Inquiry statement. That approach results, in my 15 respectful submission, in a misleading impression of Mr Stewart's actual evidence. In fairness to this 16 17 witness, to Mr Stewart and in particular from my perspective to Sergeant Maxwell, I want to put the 18 accurate individual quotes to the witness and ask 19 20 whether he thinks there was in fact any difference in 21 his approach at the interview to that taken by Ross Stewart and whether he thinks the interview 22 strategy in light of that did actually constrain 23 investigators or not. 24

If your Lordship requires the source of the quotes,

Τ	they are SBPI 00448, question 6/, and the second part of
2	the quote came from question 73.
3	That is the only issue, my Lord.
4	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. I will adjourn and consider the
5	submissions.
6	(4.17 pm)
7	(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Thursday,
8	8 February 2024)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX
2	MR KEITH HARROWER1
3	(continued)
4	Questions from MS GRAHAME1
5	(continued)
6	Rule 9 application by169
7	MS MITCHELL
8	Rule 9 application by
9	MS MCCALL
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L 4	
L5	
L 6	
L7	
L 8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	