

From: [Brown, Les](#)
To: [McGowan, Stephen](#); [Edwards, Ashley](#); [Miller, Lindsey](#); [Murphy, Liam](#)
Cc: [MacLeod, Alasdair](#); [Campbell, Erin](#)
Subject: FW: Ashley Wyse Statement 5/5/15
Date: 06 March 2017 16:11:57
Attachments: [LETTER TO AAMER ANWAR 6.3.17.doc](#)

All

I have drafted the attached letter for Mr Anwar

However I thought it prudent to check the contents of the typed statement for Wyse with the handwritten version. As you can see thanks to meticulous work by Alasdair there are clearly a series of typos and inaccuracies. Her handwritten statement is written in handwriting that is difficult to read and starts by mis spelling her surname. I have little confidence that PIRC have proof read the statements despite the assurances in John McSporrans letter I take the view that this requires to be instructed now and that it is appropriate to ask them rather than do it ourselves but am open to views

Regards

Les

From: MacLeod, Alasdair
Sent: 06 March 2017 14:55
To: Brown, Les
Cc: Campbell, Erin
Subject: Ashley Wyse Statement 5/5/15

Morning Les

As discussed on Friday prior to sending any letters to Mr Anwar and the experts I have now compared the above manuscript statement with the typed statement and somewhat concerned at what I have found.

Firstly, with regard to the paragraph which was previously omitted by PIRC there are a couple of differences between what is now the typed statement and the manuscript. These are minor but nonetheless they are differences from the manuscript. I have marked them in red below. The word 'that' is not on the manuscript statement, it reads '..definitely knew it was a black man' Also the word of is not on the manuscript and manuscript reads officer rather than officers. I can confirm that the manuscript does indeed read 'above just'

What it looked like to me was that I saw a police officer striking the man on his

legs to get him down. I am not sure whether he was completely lying down on the ground or was going down at that point. **There was at least six police officers lying on top of him. They were crossing over him from both sides. They pretty much covered his whole body. It was only when they moved that I could see his arm and definitely knew that it was a black man. It looked like one of officers was using a baton to hold the man down. It was on his upper chest towards his throat.**

When the man was on the ground with the police officers on top of him I could see him struggling with them. I saw them put some sort of yellow tape around his feet and legs over the ankle or above just.

I have checked the whole statement and worryingly there are a number of differences. The vast majority are typos but there a couple of omissions which although perhaps not material are very concerning. I think we can be pretty sure PIRC have not proof read the statements once they have been typed up. I don't think we can rely on PIRC's letter of 26 October where they say they have checked all the statements and they are in order given they have not even picked up on the mistakes highlighted in this statement when we highlighted it to them.

Given importance of this case I think we might have to request submission of all the manuscript statements and compare them against the typed copy or get PIRC to do it. I'm concerned the statements the experts and Mr Anwar have already received may not be accurate and I wonder if those manuscripts should be checked before we write to both?

I've attached scanned copies of both statements for you to have a look at. The written annotations on statements are mine. I've detailed the differences below for ease. Quite a lot of errors in one statement! (Can't send these at moment due to technical difficulties! But will do)

Utilising Typed Copy

Page 2:

Par 3 Line 2 'I could hear shouting and an disturbance. Should be 'a disturbance'

Par 4 Line 3 'The lights were on' is not on manuscript statement. Been typed in twice

Par 4 Line 5 'I then looked along the other way along Hayfield Road towards the roundabout. Manuscript continues 'to the left down from my window' but not on typed statement

Par 5 Line 2 'There was at least six surrounding him'. It should read 'There was at least six **police officers** surrounding him'

Par 6 Line 5 'I could see his arm and definitely knew that it was a black man' The word **'that'** is not in manuscript.

Par 6 Line 5 'It looked like one officer was using a baton' Manuscript reads ' It looked like one **of officers'**

Par 8 Line 3 'moved from him at **this** point' Should read 'moved from him at **'that'** point'

Page 3:

Par 1 Line 2 'they were lying on top of him' Manuscript reads ' lying on **to** of him'

Par 1 Line 3 reads as follows ' There were at least six officers around him at all times'
Manuscript reads '**At all times he was surrounded by police officers. There were at least six police officers around him at all times'**

Par 2 Line 3 ' dark **trainers'** should read 'dark **trousers'**

Par 11 Line3 '**seems'** should read '**seem'**

Page 4:

Par 9 Line 1 'The **officers** in the grey trousers appeared to pick up the batons from the ground.' Manuscript reads ' The **officer** in the grey trousers appeared to pick up the batons, **the police batons** from the ground'

Page 5:

Par 2: Line 4 ' police **officer** with the batons and doing CPR on the man. **They** only reason was that.. Should read 'police **officers** with the batons and doing CPR on the man. **The** only reason was that

Alasdair