1 Thursday, 7 March 2024 (10.00 am)2 3 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning Mr Green. Will you take the 4 oath. 5 MR DAVID GREEN (sworn) 6 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson. 7 Questions from MS THOMSON MS THOMSON: Good morning Mr Green. Are you Mr David Green? 8 9 That is correct. Α. 10 Q. May I ask how old you are? I am 64. 11 Α. 12 Q. Until your retirement in August of last year, you were a Procurator Fiscal? 13 14 That is correct. Α. 15 And you had been so for some 40 years? Q. I retired after 40 years and one day. 16 Α. Q. Mr Green, there is a blue folder in front of you and if 17 you can open it up -- in fact I see you have already 18 done that -- I would like to go through the contents of 19 20 that folder with you. 21 The Inquiry has on two occasions written to you 22 under a procedure that we refer to as Rule 8, inviting your response to a number of questions set out in 23 a letter. You should have within that folder the first 24 Rule 8 request, its reference number -- we don't need it 25

on the screen, but its reference number is SBPI 00226. 1 2 There should also be your response to that first request 3 which we will bring up on the screen, although there is 4 a hard copy in front of you. It's SBPI 00227. Are both 5 of those documents there in the folder, Mr Green? 6 Yes. Α. Grand. So we have brought up your first Rule 8 response 7 Q. on the screen. This is in effect your statement to the 8 9 Inquiry, so if I slip into referring to it as your statement rather than your Rule 8 response you will know 10 what I am referring to. The pages I don't think are 11 12 numbered but if we scroll through to the very, very end 13 we will see that it comprises 78 paragraphs and 14 concludes with a form of words that I think was provided 15 to you by the Inquiry: "I believe the facts stated in this witness 16 17 statement are true. I understand that this statement 18 may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website." 19 20 Do you see that Mr Green, on the final page? 21 Α. Yes, indeed. If we scroll to the very bottom we will see that this 22 Q. page is dated 22 December 2022. Your signature has been 23 redacted on the copies that on the screen but will 24 hopefully be visible on the hard copy in your folder? 25

earlier."

25

1 Α. It is. 2 So when you signed this statement you understood that it Q. 3 would form part of the evidence before the Inquiry, and 4 would be available to the Chair for his consideration? 5 Α. I did. When you prepared that response, did you take care to be 6 Q. 7 truthful and accurate in the answers that you gave to the questions? 8 Yes. I would say this, however: on review of the 9 Α. 10 statement, and I have had a look at it obviously in the last couple of days, at one point in the statement 11 12 I state that I had a discussion with Pat Campbell about 13 the family's attitude to post mortem and on mature 14 reflection that is not accurate, it was only 15 Keith Harrower that I spoke to. All right. Can we go perhaps then to paragraph 70, 16 Q. I think that is the paragraph that you have in mind. 17 Yes, that is correct. 18 Α. 19 Let's have a quick look at this: Q. 20 "I recall a discussion with the DSU Patrick Campbell 21 regarding the family refusing to attend the mortuary to 22 identify Mr Bayoh. I believe I had a similar discussion with Keith Harrower. The content of that discussion and 23 my decision and reasons for so deciding are set out 24

- 1 So on mature reflection, as you put it, your
- 2 recollection is that in fact you only spoke with
- 3 Mr Harrower and not with Mr Campbell?
- 4 A. To be clear, I did speak to Mr Campbell about other
- 5 matters but not about that. It was only Keith Harrower
- I spoke to about the family's potentially identifying
- 7 Mr Bayoh.
- 8 Q. Thank you for clarifying that. The Inquiry then issued
- 9 a second Rule 8 request. We don't need it on the screen
- 10 but it will be in your folder SBPI 00434. The response
- 11 that you submitted to that request, which we will bring
- up on the screen please is SBPI 00426. Again, are both
- of those documents in your folder, Mr Green?
- 14 A. They are.
- 15 Q. So this I will refer to as your second Inquiry
- statement. Again, if we scroll to the very, very end,
- this statement comprises 82 paragraphs, and it concludes
- 18 with the form of words that we looked at a moment ago at
- 19 the foot of your first statement. Again, your signature
- 20 has been redacted but would you kindly confirm for me
- that the version in front of you shows your signature on
- every page of the document?
- 23 A. It does.
- Q. And that it was signed in December of 2023?
- 25 A. That is correct.

- 1 Q. Again, in preparing this statement did you do your best
- to be truthful and accurate?
- A. Indeed, and on review I have no concerns about what is stated in this.
- 5 Q. Grand. From time to time I will ask for paragraphs from
- 6 one or other of these statements to be shown and they
- 7 will come up on the screen in front of you, the hard
- 8 copies are in that folder, Mr Green, for you to refer to
- 9 at any time if you would find that to be helpful when
- 10 you give your evidence. If there is anything that you
- 11 would like to be put up on the screen, please just let
- me know and we can arrange for that to be done.
- I understand that prior to your retirement in August
- of last year you were the head of the Homicide and Major
- 15 Crime Unit in Crown Office?
- 16 A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And prior that you had been the head of the Scottish
- 18 Fatalities and Investigation Unit?
- 19 A. Yes, I was head of SFIU from 2012 until 2019.
- Q. So seven years in that post before you became the head
- of Homicide and Major Crime?
- 22 A. Correct.
- Q. And we will be concerned today with the events
- of May 2015, as at May 2015 you were the head of SFIU?
- 25 A. That is correct.

Q. I want to begin by asking you some questions about the role of the Fiscal in deaths investigations. If we could perhaps bring up your first statement and look at page 2. The paragraph at the top of the page, where you provide a little background information. You say:

"The Lord Advocate has responsibility for the investigation of all sudden unexpected, unexplained uncertificated and suspicious deaths occurring in Scotland. In former times the local Procurator Fiscal, as representative of the Lord Advocate would be responsible for all such investigations. More recently the service has been reorganised with specialist units brought into being with responsibility for specific areas of work such as homicides (Homicide Unit) and deaths investigation (SFIU). Staff in SFIU would receive reports of deaths from the police medical practitioners, registrars of death etc and would take all necessary steps to investigate the death such as instructing post mortem examination, toxicology and any other specialist reports."

You go on to explain how you can instruct the police to carry out investigations and bring to bear the expertise of other organisations such as the Health and Safety Executive, the AAIB is that the Air Accidents Investigation Branch?

- 1 A. Bureau. Air Accident Investigations Bureau.
- 2 Q. And RAIB, what's that?
- 3 A. Rail Accident Investigations Bureau.
- 4 Q. Thank you. And take any other action required, and you
- 5 explain:
- 6 "On completion of the investigation the final report
- 7 would be sent to Crown Office for Crown Counsel
- 8 instruction on whether or not a Fatal Accident Inquiry
- 9 should be held. The decision on whether to hold a [FAI]
- is entirely a matter for the Lord Advocate."
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. I wanted to ask you some further questions arising from
- a reading of that paragraph. You explain that
- 14 the reorganisation within COPFS took place in 2012, and
- 15 you mention the Homicide Unit and SFIU.
- Before that reorganisation the local Fiscal was
- 17 responsible for deaths investigation, and I think you
- 18 explain elsewhere in your statement that at an earlier
- 19 stage in your career, in the 2000s, you had
- 20 responsibility for the Glasgow Deaths Unit?
- 21 A. That is correct, for about seven years.
- 22 Q. Seven years. So seven years managing the Deaths Unit in
- 23 Glasgow. You have told us that you were head of SFIU
- for a further seven years and then between 2019 and
- 25 2023, that is a further four years, you were head of the

- 1 Homicide and Major Crime Unit?
- 2 A. Correct.

8

9

20

21

22

- Q. So if my maths is any good that would be 18 years where
 your exclusive focus has been on the investigation of
 sudden, suspicious and unexpected deaths within one unit
 of Crown Office or another?
- 7 A. That is correct.
 - Q. Are you able to say how many deaths you have investigated over the course of your career?
- 10 Α. When I left SFIU one of my team did some research and told me that I had been responsible for over 100,000 11 12 deaths passing through the unit. Obviously I did not 13 investigate every single one of those but I had 14 significant involvement in large numbers, and obviously 15 was the last decision-maker in relation to any difficult cases that came up. I have investigated hundreds of 16 murders, I have indicted hundreds of murders, it is 17 deaths without number frankly. I couldn't begin to 18 19 guess, but thousands and thousands of them.
 - Q. Are you able to say how many deaths in custody or deaths following police contact you have investigated over the course of your career?
- A. Deaths in custody, I think probably -- there is
 a distinction, is it deaths custody in prisons or deaths
 in custody in police custody? So in police custody,

1		I think probably about seven. In prisons, significantly
2		more than that.
3	Q.	Thank you. Returning to the text on the screen you
4		explain here that:
5		"Staff in SFIU would receive reports of deaths from
6		the police, medical practitioners, registrars and
7		would take all necessary steps to investigate the
8		death~"
9		And you go on to list the sorts of steps that you
10		might take. Can you help us to understand the purpose
11		of SFIU investigating the deaths that are reported to
12		it?
13	A.	Deaths investigations in SFIU would include the
14		unexpected, the unexplained and the uncertificated.
15		Suspicious deaths generally would go to Homicide,
16		although there is a crossover insofar as a death might
17		start off looking suspicious and quickly become
18		non-suspicious once a post mortem had taken place, or
19		some other evidence had come to light.
20		So that would transfer you know, we would
21		transfer between the two units, so in dealing with
22		the deaths that are unexpected, unexplained and
23		uncertificated, no one can be buried or cremated or
24		remains disposed of in any other way without there been
25		a death certificate, and a very significant number of

1 these deaths would be cases where doctors weren't prepared to provide a certificate of cause of death and 2 3 we would then have to carry out examinations to obtain 4 a certificate. Now, sometimes that was done by 5 discussion and explanation to doctors, and they would ultimately provide a certificate, but more often than 6 7 not we would carry out a post mortem. So, to put it in context, I think the average number 8 9 of deaths that SFIU would deal with during my tenure would be about 12,000 to 13,000. Out of that we would 10 instruct about 6,800 post mortems. We would then have 11 12 a diminishing number of cases that would require full 13 investigations, so probably somewhere about 700 per annum. 14 15 Q. Thank you. Just to be clear, the figures you have 16 shared with us, are they per annum or over the course of --17 18 Α. That is per annum, yes. Per annum. 19 So you say that within SFIU you would be responsible for Q. 20 the unexpected, unexplained and uncertificated deaths. 21 Those that had the hallmarks of being homicide would go 22 directly to the Homicide Unit. For members of the public who are perhaps listening to your evidence, can 23 you give us examples of the sorts of deaths that the 24 SFIU might have reported to it? 25

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Α. As I say, any death where there was no death certificate, any death that resulted from an accident. 2 3 Part of SFIU was at that time the Road Traffic 4 Fatalities Investigation Unit, road traffic fatalities 5 were part of it. Ultimately they transferred to homicide, so I took them over again at a later point. 6 7 All deaths in prison custody would be reported to us. Any death in police custody. Anything at all that is 8 9 sudden, unexpected, unexplained, accidental, that needed 10 to be dealt with. Literally almost any kind of death, to be honest. I am sorry to put it that way but that is 11 12 the fact of the matter. 13 What would be the ultimate purpose of your unit taking Q. 14 on the responsibility for investigating that death? 15 Α. Well, the purpose in relation to those deaths that are 16

A. Well, the purpose in relation to those deaths that are uncertificated and eventually get a medical certificate of cause of death that allows the body to be disposed of, there would be no further purpose to that.

In a case of an accident, a road traffic accident, an accident at work, something of that nature, the purpose is to find out why the accident happened, and to prepare to -- if appropriate, to have a fatal accident inquiry so that a sheriff could determine the cause of death, and the cause of any accident that resulted in the death and potentially make recommendations that

might prevent future deaths. 1 Should we understand that the inquiries that you might 2 Q. 3 instruct would depend very much on the circumstances of 4 the death? 5 Yes, they are entirely case-specific. Α. You give some examples in this paragraph, where you say 6 Q. 7 that you might instruct: "... post mortem examination, toxicology and other 8 9 specialist reports." 10 That you can instruct the police to carry out investigations on your behalf, you can seek specialist 11 12 medical reports, and reports from the other 13 organisations that we have discussed. And these are but 14 examples, I think, of the sorts of powers that 15 the Fiscal has to investigate a death that is unexpected, unexplained or uncertificated. 16 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. Tell me, Mr Green, what happens when a death occurs outwith office hours? 19 It depends on the type of death, if it is a homicidal 20 Α. 21 death then it would be reported directly to the Homicide 22 on-call Fiscal. Any other death would have come to me because there was no on-call provision for SFIU, so 23 I was in effect on call all the time. It has to be said 24 that not a great number of such deaths would be 25

hours.

- reported, there was no provision say for example for
 general practitioners to call in deaths 24 hours a day.

 But deaths after police contact or a death in custody
 would -- police custody would be reported to me out of
 - Q. So if the death was an uncertificated one where the GP didn't feel they could issue a death certificate, you wouldn't be troubled by the GP over the weekend, that might wait until say the Monday morning. But if it was an unexpected or unexplained death, or there was any concern around the circumstances, then you would be contacted out of office hours?
- 13 A. Yes, that is correct. And also for all cases of organ donation.
 - Q. You have explained that you were on cover all the time,

 I think as you put it in your statement 24 hours a day,

 365 days a year. Can you help us to understand just how often you were in fact contacted out of office hours?
 - A. There was no typical week but what I can say is that
 I never managed to see a single one of my son's rugby
 games right through on a Saturday morning because
 invariably I was called about something and had to leave
 the other parents and go to somewhere quiet to take the
 call. So it was ... I would imagine maybe 30-40 times
 at the weekend over the course of a year, something like

1 that. 2 Sorry, is that 30-40 times over the course of a 12-month Q. 3 period? 4 Α. Yes. 5 Not 30-40 calls on a single weekend? Q. 6 No, not at all. And some weeks you might get a huge Α. 7 number of calls for organ donation or whatever other reason and other times, you know, it's quiet, you 8 9 just -- it's entirely unexpected, the phone rings and 10 your heart sinks, to be frank. So every week would be different, there was no such 11 Q. 12 thing as a typical week but if you were to average it 13 out, just to give us a feel for the level of commitment, 14 it would 30 to 40 calls per annum? 15 Α. Yes. Am I right to understand that as a Fiscal, and indeed as 16 Q. 17 an on-call Fiscal, you had a number of resources 18 available to you provided by the Crown Office? 19 I had a mobile phone which had an ability to send Α. 20 and receive emails. For major incidents, major 21 disasters, I had a folder that I had prepared for myself 22 and various items of on-call kit, but really nothing beyond that. 23 Q. In terms of the Crown Office publications, would you 24

have had access to, for example, the Deaths Manual of

25

1 Practice? 2 No, not normally. I could have printed it out and taken Α. 3 it home but I didn't do that, I didn't feel the need to. 4 Q. You are a very experienced Fiscal, did you contribute to 5 the writing of the Deaths Manual of Practice? Yes. Myself and a colleague wrote them. 6 Α. 7 All right, so it might not be something that you would Q. need to have to hand as a ready reckoner, if you were 8 responsible for the content? 9 10 Α. I certainly didn't feel the need to do so. Had I done, had I felt the need I would have printed them out. But 11 12 sometimes I would get calls from other Fiscals 13 throughout the country who would have been contacted by 14 the police about a death when they shouldn't necessarily 15 have gone to them rather than me, and I would give advice to them, so I was immersed in it. 16 All right. Just for completeness, should we understand 17 Q. that there is a Deaths Manual of Practice that is 18 19 published by the Crown Office? 20 Α. Yes. 21 It's available as a resource to Fiscals, presumably on Q. 22 your intranet, but in printable format if you wanted to take it home for on-call purposes. Are there also 23 Crown Office circulars that might bear on the subject of 24 death investigation? 25

- 1 A. Yes. Even some other things going back further to the
- 2 book of regulations, so there is a lot of information
- 3 there. And we would train new entrants into SFIU on
- 4 that.
- 5 Q. Finally, was there also something called Serious and
- 6 Complex Case Guidance: Preliminary Investigation of
- 7 Suspicious Deaths and On-call Duties?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Is that a document that you are familiar with?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Did you play any part in authoring that document?
- 12 A. Not that I recall.
- 13 Q. All right. I want to ask some questions about
- the instruction of post mortem examinations, in a very
- 15 general sense. Can you help those listening to your
- evidence to understand in what circumstances the Fiscal
- would instruct an autopsy?
- 18 A. In a case of a death arising out of an accident or from
- a homicidal act the Fiscal would always instruct
- 20 a two-doctor post mortem. As I have said in relation to
- 21 SFIU deaths where the death is unexplained or
- 22 uncertificated, sometimes it was possible to speak to
- 23 the doctor to say: what is your concern here? And get
- 24 them to provide a certificate. If no certificate was
- forthcoming we would instruct a single-doctor

- 1 post mortem, simply to obtain an MCCD that allowed death
- 2 to be registered.
- 3 Q. That is a medical certificate of cause of death?
- 4 A. Cause of death.
- 5 Q. All right. You said in any homicidal death you would
- 6 instruct two doctors?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. Is that for reasons of corroboration?
- 9 A. Indeed, absolutely. And it goes without saying that
- 10 that also applies to those deaths where there is
- 11 a potential for a fatal accident inquiry, because once
- 12 again you are looking for that requirement of
- corroboration.
- Q. Would that include a death in custody?
- 15 A. Absolutely.
- Q. Where, as I understand it, there is a mandatory
- 17 requirement for a fatal accident inquiry?
- 18 A. It is a mandatory inquiry.
- 19 Q. Typically, after a death has been notified to the
- 20 Fiscal, how soon does the autopsy take place?
- 21 A. It's important to have the autopsy at the earliest
- 22 possible time. That is where you get the best
- 23 examination. It's most likely that the results won't be
- corrupted. When I was first a depute, and for many
- 25 years when I was doing on-call for Homicide in Glasgow,

25

1 30 plus years ago, we would do post mortem examinations in such cases more or less immediately, the body would 2 3 be taken straight to the mortuary and a post mortem 4 would happen at all hours of the day and night, weekends 5 included. That has slightly changed but we would still be trying to have a post mortem as quickly as possible. 6 7 So unfortunately pathologists are a very limited resource, mortuaries are a similarly limited resource 8 9 there is not infrequently delays in dealing with what 10 I -- perhaps it's the wrong word to use, but the routine deaths, the deaths where you are simply seeking an MCCD. 11 12 Different criteria apply where you are looking at 13 a homicide or something akin to that, where you would be 14 seeking to have the pathologist deal with that 15 post mortem as soon as possible, at the earliest possible time they could undertake the examination. 16 17 So that is dependent on mortuary availability, and 18 dependent on there being two suitably qualified forensic 19 pathologists available to carry out the examination. Q. You said that an autopsy, and in particular a homicidal 20 21 autopsy, should take place at the earliest possible time 22 to minimise -- I think you said the risk of corruption of the evidence. Sorry, I don't have access to the 23 transcript while we are speaking. Can you elaborate on 24

that please, explain a little more what you mean by

1 that?

- 2 Well, bodies deteriorate from the moment of death. The Α. 3 natural breakdown of the body that occurs in every case, 4 starts immediately. So, for example, it's not uncommon 5 in a post mortem that is delayed to find post mortem alcohol which the body generates itself, it is not 6 7 a reflection of alcohol that has been consumed by the deceased, it is alcohol that has been generated in the 8 9 body. Marks can be -- can be less visible, they can 10 deteriorate, you can end up with all sorts of issues if there is a delay in the examination. So any death where 11 12 an individual is found after a period of time after 13 death, it's a more difficult post mortem because of the degeneration of the body tissues. 14
 - Q. I would like to ask you some questions -- again, general questions at this stage around identification of a body and if we could turn to paragraph 72 of your statement, please. Sorry this may be the second statement. It has the paragraph numbers.
 - A. I think it's the first statement.
- Q. Sorry, it's the first statement, thank you. In the
 first statement there is a lengthy passage which doesn't
 have a paragraph number and then towards the end of the
 statement there are paragraph numbers, so it's page 12.
- 25 A. Yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 Q. Thank you Mr Green. So page 12 of the first statement, paragraph 72. Here you explain that: 2 3 "As part of the post mortem process the Fiscal must 4 ensure that the deceased is properly identified. Often 5 that is by visual identification by friends or relatives but other means such as fingerprints, DNA and odontology 6 7 can be used. It is a matter for the Fiscal to decide the means of identification dependent on the 8 9 circumstances of the death and the condition of the 10 body. There are international standards for this~... A body is not released until identification is certain." 11 12 In what circumstances would you instruct 13 identification by visual means, through friends or 14 relatives? Would that be the first port of call in 15 an ordinary case? Historically certainly yes. It is my understanding that 16 Α. 17 following the pandemic the Fiscals are moving to try to identify by other means rather than, you know, having 18 19 nearest relatives attend at the mortuary and go through 20 what is potentially very likely a trauma in having to 21 identify. So we seek to have visual identification less 22 and less, and in some cases visual identification is simply not possible because of the nature of the 23 injuries that the deceased has suffered. I would say 24 historically, and certainly at the time of Mr Bayoh's 25

24

25

1 death, it would be normal practice to seek to have nearest relatives identify. 2 Q. Would it only be in a case where, for whatever reason, 3 4 that wasn't possible or desirable that you would move to 5 looking to establish identification via fingerprints, 6 DNA or odontology? 7 At that time, yes, but as I say I think things are Α. moving towards a less -- a more scientific 8 identification rather than a visual one. 9 10 Q. I want to ask a few questions around the role of the Fiscal and family liaison, again just by way of setting 11 12 the scene and background. If we can scroll to 13 paragraph 45, please of this statement: 14 "The role of COPFS in family liaison begins at the 15 point of handover from the FLOs assigned to the family. In the greatest majority of cases these are police FLOs 16 17 but in a smaller number of cases they will be from PIRC. In most cases a FLO/Victim Information and Advice (VIA) 18 19 handover takes place shortly after an individual has 20 been charged and appeared in court. VIA staff are part 21 of COPFS. In certain cases where a prosecution will not 22 take place the handover happens at a suitable point after the case has been reported to us. Such cases 23

might be where no action is contemplated or possible or

an FAI is in contemplation."

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the handover from the FLOs, whether it's police

FLOs or PIRC FLOs, is to VIA, Victim Information and

Advice. Can you tell us just a little bit about the

Victim Information and Advice Service within the Crown

Office?

There are really two levels of Victim Information and Α. Advice, some deal with summary cases where there is simply telephoning and updating victims of crime about what has happened in the court that day or bail status, something like that. But in deaths cases there are more highly trained Victim Information and Advice officers, who will take to do with the families meetings, they will meet the family, they will explain the process, they will find -- find out from the family what sort of contact they wish, whether that is in person, by telephone, on Teams, whatever, and they will keep the family abreast of developments throughout the whole process of the case, so through the investigative process up to the conclusion of a trial, if there is such a thing, or the end of an FAI if that is the ultimate outcome.

Clearly not all cases end up in court, so they are also dealing with them until there is a point where there is an explanation, probably in the presence of the VIA officer but carried out by an investigator in SFIU

- or one of the Fiscals in SFIU where it is explained to
 the family that our investigations have come to an end
 and why that has happened.
 - Q. You say that in a case involving criminality the point of handover will ordinarily be when the individual has been charged and appeared in court, and in other cases it would be after the matter has been reported to the Crown Office. Can we take it that could be weeks or months later, weeks or months after the death?
 - A. No, not -- not -- I wouldn't suggest it would be weeks or months. FLOs -- FLO officers in the police, and indeed in PIRC, are again a very limited resource, there are very, very few of these individuals who are highly trained to carry out that role. So in something like a major disaster it's a real problem to have enough FLOs to actually deal with the number of deceaseds that you are facing.

So, you know, the role of the FLO is to get in to meet the family, to support them in the early stages of the investigation but they would be seeking to get out of that and pass that responsibility to the Crown at the earliest opportunity, so they can go on to the next case so to speak.

24 Q. So --

25 A. So it varies depending on the nature of the

25

1 investigation. Some cases where there is plainly a homicide, there may not be an individual identified as 2 3 the perpetrator and that would mean that the FLO 4 involvement would be extended, potentially for a very 5 long time. There are some unsolved cases that I am aware of, they are solved now, but FLOs were engaged 6 7 with the family over a period of years. Now, that contact was not constant but they maintained 8 9 a relationship with them. So it's all case dependent, 10 to be frank. All case dependent. But in the ordinary course of 11 Q. 12 things, with say a death in custody, would there ever be 13 a role for VIA in your experience before the point that 14 the matter is reported to the Crown Office by the PIRC? 15 Α. There might be handover from PIRC FLOs to VIA once they have reached a point in their investigation that all 16 17 sides are confident that more or less the -- that what 18 has happened is understood and that it can then be 19 passed over. But again, I don't know what happened in 20 this case, I have no knowledge of that. 21 Q. Do VIA provide a service outwith office hours? 22 Α. No. I want to move on to asking questions, again general 23 Q. questions, about the role of the Fiscal in directing the 24

investigation into the circumstances of a death in

1 police custody. So if we could stay with your first statement, please, and look at page 2. Paragraphs 3 and 2 3 4: "Before the advent of Police Scotland it was open to 4 the Procurator Fiscal, in consultation with the local 5 Chief Constable to instruct an outside force to 6 7 investigate any death in police custody. When Police Scotland were established it was necessary for 8 9 the role of the ... (PIRC) to be extended to include 10 an investigative role in order that they could, independently, investigate any death in police custody 11 12 or following contact with the police. 13 "In advance of Police Scotland coming into being in 14 2013 and having regard to the enhanced role of the PIRC, 15 meetings had to be held involving Crown Office, the Police and PIRC to establish the process for dealing 16 17 with deaths in custody of the police or following contact with the police in order that all organisations 18 understood their role. I was involved in these 19 20 discussions along with my then colleague Kate Frame who 21 was the Head of Criminal Complaints Against the Police Division at Crown Office." 22 I will stop there because I don't think we need to 23 concern ourselves with the remainder of that paragraph 24 for now. So you go on, however, to say that a procedure 25

that was agreed was that in such cases it would be the

Professional Standards Department of Police Scotland who

would contact you or your deputy, such that you might

consider whether the PIRC should be instructed to

investigate or whether an investigation should be left

with Police Scotland. Was that the mechanism that was

put in place?

A. Yes, indeed.

- Q. You say too that not all deaths following police contact require to be independently investigated, but all deaths in police custody do. Can you explain please to anyone who is listening what the difference is between a death in custody and a death following police contact?
- A. Well, as I indicated earlier, a death in custody is a mandatory fatal accident inquiry so that requires to be independently investigated with a view to the FAI further down the line.

In relation to a death after police contact, it very much depends on the scenario, so for example I might get a telephone call from Professional Standards out of hours to tell me that -- and this happened frequently in the early days before we sort of established what the parameters were, I would get calls to say: we were in contact with this deceased individual nine months ago, for example, about a certain thing, and you know there

investigate.

- was no -- no nexus whatever between the earlier contact
 and the death, and I would decline to become involved in
 those circumstances. So again, it would very much
 depend on the nature of the contact, and if I felt it
 was necessary and appropriate I would instruct PIRC to
- Q. As you said a moment ago, all deaths in police custody
 require to be independently investigated, and there
 would be a mandatory fatal accident inquiry and it's the
 PIRC who would be instructed by you to carry out that
 investigation?
- 12 A. Yes.

6

- Q. For completeness we have heard evidence that
 the legislation that gives you the authority to instruct
 the PIRC to investigate a death in police custody is the
 Police, Public Order and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act
 2006 and it's section 33A(b)(ii). Is that correct?
- 18 A. (b) (i) and (ii), I think.
- Q. I wondered whether the Act by virtue of (b)(i) also
 gives the authority to carry out an investigation where
 there is an indication that a police officer may have
 committed an offence?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. So a (b) (i) instruction would be in relation to
 potential criminality, and a (b) (ii) instruction would

- be in relation to a death following -- a death in police
 custody, amongst other things?
- A. Yes, a death the Fiscal has to investigate, yes. That is correct.
- Q. I am using a shorthand but just to understand that there is a distinction in the legislation in terms of which provision the instruction would be issued to the PIRC under, depending on whether you are instructing the PIRC to investigate a death in police custody or a suspicion of criminality on the part of a police officer?
- 11 A. Indeed.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

12 Q. I want to move on now to ask some questions about your
13 involvement following the death of Sheku Bayoh on
14 3 May 2015. I wonder if we might look at the first page
15 of your first statement. I beg your pardon, page 3 of
16 your first statement and it's the final paragraph on
17 that page:

"On Sunday 3 May 2015 I received a telephone call from the on-call senior officer at Professional Standards, Police Scotland. I cannot now recall who this was. I was advised that an incident, resulting in a death in custody had occurred in Kirkcaldy. I was advised that at about 07.15 hours police had received calls from the public alerting them to a black male, stripped to the waist, brandishing a knife and

1 approaching members of the public in cars. My recollection was that he was said to have banged the 2 3 knife on the roof of a car being driven by a nurse on 4 her way to work. I was advised that officers had been 5 detailed to search for this male and that 4 police vehicles containing 7 officers had located the man. On 6 7 approaching him he had run at the officers and a struggle ensued." 8 9 If we can scroll down to the top of the next page: 10 "I was advised that he had struck a female officer but that this was not with a knife. I was told that 11 12 PAVA spray had been used but that this had no effect. 13 That the man had been struck with batons and that during 14 the restraint handcuffs and leg restraints had been 15 utilised. "I was told that during this the male had collapsed 16 17 and that CPR had been commenced by police officers and continued by ambulance personnel who were called to the 18 19 scene. The man, who was named as Sheku Bayoh, was 20 conveyed to the Victoria Infirmary, Kirkcaldy where he 21 received treatment but despite the efforts of medical personnel he had succumbed." 22 Now, you say in your statement, Mr Green, that you 23 can't recall who called you. We heard evidence from 24 Pat Campbell, the SIO, that it may have been 25

- a Superintendent Craig Blackhall who was on call for

 Professional Standards who made contact with you. Does

 that jog your memory at all?
- A. It certainly was Craig Blackhall, because again I have
 been thinking about this, as you would anticipate, and
 I did recall that it was Craig Blackhall who called me.
 I hadn't remembered that at the time of preparing the
 statement.
- 9 Q. Do you recall what time he called you?
- 10 A. I think it was about 9 o'clock.

16

17

18

19

- 11 Q. The Inquiry may have before it an email, which

 12 I'm afraid I am not in a position to put on the screen

 13 just now, from Craig Blackhall to others, which tends to

 14 suggest that he might have called you at about 9.25 am.

 15 Would you take any issue with that?
 - A. I wouldn't take any issue with that. I know I was immediately trying to speak to PIRC and I spoke to them about 9.30, so that may very well be absolutely accurate.
- 20 Q. You explain in your statement, we don't need to go to
 21 the paragraph but you do explain that you took notes at
 22 the time that you received the call but you cannot now
 23 locate them, and you have provided here quite a detailed
 24 description of the information that was provided to you
 25 some years ago now. I wanted to ask, have you provided

1 that account from your memory?

20

21

22

23

- 2 Yes, I suppose it was appropriate to say this though, Α. 3 there were a lot of phone calls and I was given different little bits of information at different times 4 5 and at this remove I can't be absolutely certain what bit of information I received at what point in time. 6 7 But I do know that when Superintendent Blackhall called me, he advised me that it had happened at about 7.15, 8 9 that there was a black male, that a knife had been 10 involved, there was -- the police were sent to search for him, there had been this altercation and the other 11 12 elements of CPR et cetera were all given at that time.
- 13 Q. If we could scroll back up a little bit so we are
 14 looking at the final paragraph on page 3, please. There
 15 is a reference here about halfway down to the black male
 16 being "stripped to the waist", and otherwise bare
 17 chested, I just wondered how confident you were in your
 18 recollection that that information had been provided to
 19 you by Mr Blackhall at that time?
 - A. I can't swear to that, I'm afraid. I was certainly told that at some point. I think it was at that point but I really couldn't be absolutely sure at this remove and without access to my contemporaneous notes.
- Q. The very final line of text there is a reference to

 Mr Bayoh running at the officers. Again, is that

25

1 information that you are confident you were provided with by Craig Blackhall or perhaps someone else? 2 A. I can't be sure if it was Craig Blackhall who said that 3 4 but certainly he told me that there had been 5 a confrontation between the individual and police officers. That part may have come later, to be honest. 6 7 As I say, there were many calls. I appreciate there were many calls and it was many years 8 Q. 9 ago now, but should we understand that your evidence is 10 that at some stage you were told that Mr Bayoh was stripped to the waist? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 And that at some stage you were told that the officers Q. 14 attended, located him and on approaching him he ran at 15 the officers? 16 Α. Yes. If we can go to page 4 of your statement, please. It's 17 Q. 18 the third paragraph down: "I informed the officer ..." 19 20 Craig Blackhall, I think? 21 Α. Yes. "... that I intended to refer the matter to PIRC who 22 Q. would take over the investigation. I was also advised 23 that it appeared Mr Bayoh had been watching a boxing 24

match earlier in the morning with friends and that there

1 had been some sort of altercation between them. I instructed that Police Scotland could carry on 2 3 investigating this earlier incident but that 4 the circumstances leading up to his death were to be 5 investigated by PIRC." 6 You go on to say in the next paragraph: 7 "I then tried to contact the PIRC on-call number, my recollection is that the call went to voicemail 8 9 and I asked to be called back. I then called my 10 colleague Stephen McGowan and made him aware of the circumstances as I understood them, that I was referring 11 12 the matter to PIRC and would also take steps to arrange 13 a 2-doctor post mortem. I was concerned that the Crown 14 Agent, Law Officers and other colleagues be made aware 15 of this as I anticipated media interest in what was obviously a high-profile incident." 16 17 I wanted to ask you questions arising from these paragraphs in your statement. You said, I think a few 18 19 moments ago, that it was about 9.30 that you called 20 PIRC? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Is that right? You obviously left a message and I think Q. perhaps spoke with PIRC a short time later. Was it 9.30 23 that you called and left a message or was it 9.30 that 24 you spoke to someone at PIRC, do you recall? 25

- 1 A. I can't say.
- 2 Q. You said you called the PIRC on-call number. Is that
- a number you had ever had occasion to use before?
- 4 A. I had used it many times.
- 5 Q. Was it usual for it to go to voicemail?
- A. No, but at that time in the morning, you know,
- 7 potentially someone in the shower. I thought nothing of
- 8 it. Normally the call would be picked up immediately.
- 9 And that phone was passed around the on-call PIRC
- investigators, so it was a number I was familiar with.
- 11 Q. Was there much of a lapse of time between you calling
- and leaving the message and you speaking with someone
- from PIRC?
- 14 A. I don't think there was much lapse of time at all.
- 15 Q. You mention there your colleague Stephen McGowan. Who
- is Stephen McGowan and what was his role at the time?
- 17 A. Stephen McGowan was my immediate senior officer, so to
- speak, based in Crown Office and who had responsibility
- 19 for some of the specialist units, in particular at that
- 20 time SFIU, also Homicide and other units.
- 21 Q. Is that why you were calling him, just to make him
- 22 aware?
- 23 A. Yes, I thought that he needed to be made aware
- 24 immediately and I was concerned to ensure that such
- information as we had was passed on to the Crown agent,

1 law officers et cetera in order that there was knowledge 2 of this potentially before it hit the media. Q. Yes. You say that you anticipated the matter being high 3 4 profile. You say: "... I anticipated media interest in what was 5 obviously a high-profile incident." 6 7 What aspect of the circumstances as they were made known to you made you anticipate a high profile and 8 media interest in the case? 9 10 Α. Well, my entire role was to deal with deaths 11 investigations and as a consequence of that I maintained 12 an interest in deaths that were happening elsewhere in 13 the United Kingdom, deaths that were happening abroad. 14 I was aware there had been a very high profile matter in 15 America, where an individual who was black had died, again at the hands of white police officers. I was 16 17 aware of similar cases that had occurred in England. It 18 seemed to me very obvious that this would be a matter of 19 significant concern given Mr Bayoh was black and the officers were, I assumed, white. 20 21 The case that you mentioned in the USA, where about in Q. 22 America was that? A. Gosh, at this remove I can't say. I think it might have 23 been Baltimore but I am not 100% certain on that. And 24 there have of course been many other cases since. 25

1 Q. Can we look at the final paragraph on page 4, please: "At about 9.30 I made contact with Keith Harrower, 2 3 Senior Investigator at PIRC who was on call. I made him 4 aware of the circumstances and instructed that PIRC 5 should investigate the incident from the point of the reports coming into the police about his behaviour till 6 7 his being confirmed dead at the hospital. That the police would investigate the matters that occurred 8 9 elsewhere, earlier that morning as they did not appear 10 connected and that I would arrange a 2-doctor post mortem. I confirmed that the body was at the 11 12 Victoria Infirmary and would be transferred to Edinburgh 13 City Mortuary for examination. I also advised that all 14 officers involved were either at or on their way to 15 Kirkcaldy Police Office where a post-incident management process would take place." 16 17 So this was your first direct contact with PIRC, you 18 spoke with Keith Harrower and gave him instructions to 19 investigate from the time that reports were received by 20 the police up to the point of death, and that the police 21 would investigate the matters earlier that morning. 22 So the investigation was effectively being split between the PIRC and Police Scotland. You provide 23 an explanation for that in your second statement. 24 I think I can probably just read this out to you because 25

1 it is short. For your benefit it's at paragraph 8 of 2 your second statement. You say: 3 "I also instructed the police should investigate earlier incidents and alleged drug taking as at that 4 5 time they did not appear directly related and in truth I had concerns about the PIRC's ability to staff 6 7 a potentially large inquiry given they are a small organisation." 8 9 You reiterate that at paragraph 16 of your second 10 statement, where you say: "I was concerned not to overwhelm the PIRC's limited 11 12 resources." 13 Can you help me to understand what your concerns 14 were around the PIRC's resources? 15 A. It was a holiday weekend in the West of Scotland, in fact probably all of Scotland other than Edinburgh. 16 17 I knew that PIRC would have to assemble staff who were not on call, so there may be difficulties in them 18 19 getting those staff together. They then would have to 20 travel a significant distance to get to Kirkcaldy, I was 21 area Fiscal in Fife for a period so I know how long that 22 journey takes, and it seemed to me that -- I also knew that PIRC were a small organisation, they did not have 23 large numbers of investigators, and in my view given the 24 information I had, I was told that there had been 25

1 a boxing match on in the middle of the night, that Mr Bayoh and others had been watching, there had then 2 3 been some fall out or other -- and some altercation had 4 taken place. That appeared to be quite distinct and 5 separate from what I was being told had happened during the -- during the period that the police were aware of 6 7 something going on, ie from the time they started to get calls through to the point where Mr Bayoh had died and 8 9 I felt the two things could easily be separated. For 10 that matter they could be brought back together again later, as in fact transpired. But it was to try to 11 12 allow PIRC to get proper resources to start 13 investigating the death which was the really important issue for me. 14 15 Q. Did you discuss your concern around resourcing with Keith Harrower? 16 No, I don't recall that I did. 17 Α. 18 If PIRC had had more in the way of resourcing than they Q. 19 did at that point in 2015, would you have been inclined 20 to instruct them to investigate the matter in its 21 entirety? 22 To be honest I really don't know what the answer to that Α. is. As I say, the information that I had from 23 Professional Standards suggested that what had taken 24 25 place earlier was distant in time and place from what

1 had occurred involving the police and Mr Bayoh. So 2 I might still have made the same decision and I certainly separated investigations in other cases, 3 4 where it seemed appropriate to do so, where the 5 matters -- where there was a disjunct, if I can put it that way, between the issues. 6 7 Q. Thank you. If we can look at page 5 of your statement, paragraph 2, please. You say: 8 "I next called back the officer from Police 9 Professional Standards~..." 10 That will be Craig Blackhall. Sorry, I will let you 11 12 find that. This is your first statement --Yes, I have it. 13 Α. Q. -- page 5, the paragraph at the top of the page: 14 15 "I next called back the officer from Police Professional Standards~..." 16 17 Who we know is Craig Blackhall: "... advising him of Keith Harrower's identity and 18 19 contact details and confirmed my instructions. I was advised senior officers were aware and that a handover 20 21 to PIRC would be facilitated." 22 Were you advised when that handover was likely going to take place? 23 A. No, there was no discussion about that, and plainly no 24 25 handover really could take place until PIRC had managed

- to get on the ground in Kirkcaldy. It was a matter for

 Keith Harrower and his staff as well as the police to

 arrange that at an appropriate and convenient time.
 - Q. What were your expectations in terms of the timescale for Keith Harrower and his team mobilising and getting to Kirkcaldy?
 - A. I doubted that Keith would go on his own, I anticipated he would certainly wish to have someone else with him to act as a noter, if nothing else. I thought that might take about an hour to get organised and a couple of hours to travel there, so I was anticipating that there would be at least some PIRC staff on the ground within a period of about three hours. But I believe I made it very clear that I wanted them to get to Kirkcaldy and take control of this as quickly as they possibly could.
 - Q. So by 9.30, or shortly after 9.30, you had been notified of the death, you had taken the decision to instruct the PIRC to investigate from the time that the reports were received to the point of death, and that the police would investigate the earlier events. You had advised the PIRC of your instruction, you had advised Professional Standards of your instruction and you had taken steps to advise colleagues within the Crown Office and ensure that the law officers and the Crown agent were aware of the death. I think you have explained in

- your statement, we don't need to go to it, but that you
 followed up these various instructions with emails?
- 3 A. Yes, I said by BlackBerry.
- Q. In particular you mentioned sending an email to the PIRC making clear that the basis of your instruction was that they should investigate a death in custody as opposed to an instruction to investigate criminality.
- 8 A. Yes, I instructed PIRC in terms of 33A to investigate 9 the death.
- Q. You explain in your second statement, paragraph 4, it's
 a short paragraph we may not need to bring it up but you
 explain that at the time of your original instruction
 you did not consider that you had any indication that
 a person serving with the police may have committed
 an offence.
- 16 A. That is correct.
- 17 Q. That was the reason for the instruction being to
 18 investigate a death in custody rather than criminality?
- 19 A. Indeed.
- Q. Can we return to -- sorry, we are on page 5. The bottom
 of page 5, please, where you go on to explain the
 arrangements that you then put in place for the conduct
 of an autopsy. You say:
- "I then spent some considerable time making
 arrangements for the transfer of the body to Edinburgh,

for 2 forensic pathologists to conduct the examination 1 and that a Quasar examination would be utilised in 2 3 advance of the PM. As 4th May was a public holiday in 4 Glasgow I also arranged that an experienced colleague 5 from the Edinburgh office, Bernard Ablett, on call for homicides in East Scotland, would attend the PM." 6 7 I wanted to ask some questions around that. You say you made arrangements for the transfer of the body to 8 9 Edinburgh, what did those arrangements involve? 10 Α. That was an instruction to the police to have their undertaker -- and they have are a contract for moving 11 12 bodies around -- available to transport the body and 13 that it required to go to Edinburgh City Mortuary for 14 examination. That would -- the movement of that body 15 would be in control of PIRC, I expected PIRC would take control of the body at the Victoria Infirmary in 16 17 Kirkcaldy so the timing of that was not set down, it was 18 simply that this required to happen and the body had to be in Edinburgh effectively that day, so that it was 19 20 available for a post mortem process starting at about 21 12 noon the following day. You mention contact with the two forensic pathologists, 22 Q. and also the Quasar examination. What arrangements are 23 in place for contacting a pathologist out of hours? 24 25 Α. Generally speaking on-call homicide deputes would go

1 through police force control to contact them because 2 they keep a note of who the on-call pathologists are. 3 My recollection is that I knew it was Kerryanne Shearer 4 who was on call, and I know all the forensic 5 pathologists very well so I had all their telephone numbers anyway, so I simply called her directly to ask 6 7 about mortuary capacity, mortuary availability, the availability of another pathologist, and indeed whether 8 9 she herself could do the examination on the Monday 10 because it might have been that she had a court commitment or something else, so it was to arrange two 11 12 pathologists and the mortuary. 13 So I would do that via Kerryanne. She would then 14 contact the mortuary and tell them to expect this 15 deceased coming from Kirkcaldy, and that it was 16 a criminal justice post mortem process, so there are 17 arrangements that need to be put in place to ensure that 18 body is not brought into contact with other bodies and 19 all of those sorts of things, to avoid 20 cross-contamination. 21 Tell us more about the conversation you had with Q. 22 Dr Shearer in terms of setting up the arrangements for the autopsy. You asked about her availability, you 23 asked whether a second forensic pathologist could be 24 available, you have mentioned already -- and we will 25

- come to this -- that the autopsy started at midday on

 the 4th. Had you suggested to her that you wanted the

 autopsy to take place the following day, and bearing in

 mind what you said earlier about the desirability of

 conducting an autopsy as soon as possible?
 - A. I simply asked her what the earliest time an autopsy could be conducted was, and that was dependent, as I say, on mortuary capacity and the availability of the forensic pathologists. I certainly made it clear, not that I think I needed to, to Kerryanne, that this was a case that had to be done as quickly as possible given the circumstances, given it was a death in custody, and we needed to know what had caused Mr Bayoh's death.
 - Q. You said a moment ago you made it clear to Dr Shearer that this was an autopsy that had to be conducted as quickly as possible given the circumstances. By that do you mean because that was the death of a man, perhaps even a black man, in police custody?
 - A. No, it was the death of a man who had died while in custody of police officers. It mattered not that Mr Bayoh was black. That wasn't the issue at all. The issue was that we needed to know whether this man's death had been brought about by acts of the police officers.

1	Q.	So this was imperative for the early post mortem. Over
2		and above what you said earlier about a body begins to
3		decompose from the moment of death so there is
4		a desirability in any case to perform the autopsy as
5		quickly as possible but the imperative in this case was
6		this had been a death in custody and you needed to know
7		whether that death had been brought about by the actions
8		of the police officers?

A. Or indeed whether he might have died of natural causes.

It was essential to know as best we could from the post mortem why Mr Bayoh had died, that is the foundation stone upon when the entire investigation is built and without that it is difficult to see what you investigate or how because you simply do not have any idea why he has died.

I was given information some time during the day,

I am sure I discussed this with Kerryanne, that he

didn't appear to have any bleeding injuries, there was

nothing obvious that had been found at the

Victoria Infirmary. Now, I am sure that must have come

from the A&E doctors who had tried to save his life but

I certainly was left in a situation where there was

nothing obvious that could account for his death and it

seemed essential to get that information at the earliest

possible time.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 Q. You mention there Quasar. What is that?
- Quasar is a light source that can be used to bring up 2 Α. 3 markings on a body that are not necessarily obvious to 4 the naked eye. So it will show underlying bruising, 5 for example, and in this particular case the reason that I instructed a Quasar examination was in discussion with 6 7 Dr Shearer I explained that Mr Bayoh was black, she expressed a concern that that might make seeing bruising 8 9 on the body more difficult, and suggested that to assist 10 her and her colleague we should have a Quasar examination. That seemed eminently sensible to me, so 11 12 I instructed Quasar be deployed.
- Q. You mention arranging for Bernard Ablett, who was on call for homicides in the east of Scotland to attend the autopsy given you were on a public holiday and he, being in Edinburgh, wasn't. Help us to understand what is the Fiscal's role at an autopsy?
 - A. The Fiscal's role in any sudden -- suspicious death rather than sudden -- in a suspicious death is to attend to ensure that the autopsy is conducted appropriately, that appropriate samples are taken, that the labels attached to the samples are all signed, but also to get a readout from the forensic pathologists at the end of the examination as to what their findings are. Now, that is not binding them to those findings, sometimes

7

8

9

10

- they will express a view: well, I think this but I will
 need to do some histology, I will need to do some lab
 work before I come to a concluded view but these are my
 findings at this point in time, thus to give the Crown
 Office an understanding of what it is we are actually
 looking at.
 - Q. Was it during the course of your call with Dr Shearer that you agreed with her that there was capacity, there were two forensic pathologists available and that the autopsy would commence at 12 o'clock the following day?
- 12 Yes, I am not sure if there was more than one call, I am Α. 13 not sure if Kerryanne had to check with the mortuary but 14 whatever we came to that view and there were two 15 pathologists available, there was a space in the 16 mortuary at that point. When you are doing a suspicious 17 death it is essential that the mortuary be cleaned entirely before you start it. You can't just go in and 18 19 carry out that examination where you perhaps have done 20 eight, ten routine post mortems earlier in the day. So 21 there is a process where the pathologist will deal with 22 the cause of death examinations, then the mortuary will be fully cleaned in order to preserve any evidence that 23 might be recovered during that process. So it's not 24 just as simple as saying, you know, we expect to finish 25

- at 11.30 so we will start again at 11.45. There is
- 2 a process that has to be gone through.
- Q. Do you recall what time it was that you had this conversation or these conversations with Dr Shearer?
- 5 A. I would be guessing, saying somewhere around about
- 6 10/10.30ish, I do remember after the initial burst of
- 7 telephone calls and quick emails which I felt were --
- 8 had to go immediately, I made myself a cup of coffee and
- 9 sat down for a few minutes because it was a bit frantic,
- 10 to be frank. So I then started those other calls.
- I had no idea when I phoned Dr Shearer whether we would
- 12 be looking at Monday or Tuesday or potentially even
- a later date in the week. But I was concerned, as
- I have indicated, to do this as quickly as possible.
- 15 Q. So by the time you had this call, I appreciate you might
- be guessing here but you think maybe 10 or 10.30?
- 17 A. It was certainly during the morning.
- 18 Q. Okay, during the morning of the 3rd or let's say by
- 19 lunchtime on the 3rd the autopsy had been scheduled for
- lunchtime on the 4th. Would that be a reasonable way
- 21 of --
- 22 A. Correct.
- Q. -- putting it?
- A. Correct.
- 25 Q. Now at that point in time when you finalised or put

- in place these arrangement for the autopsy did you know
- 2 whether the death message had been delivered to
- 3 Mr Bayoh's family?
- 4 A. I did not know that.
- 5 Q. Did you know whether police FLOs had been appointed?
- A. I had no knowledge of that. I had no real knowledge of
- 7 what was going on in Kirkcaldy at all.
- 8 Q. Did you know whether PIRC FLOs had been appointed?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Did you know whether PIRC FLOs were even on duty on the
- 11 Sunday?
- 12 A. No. I was totally unaware of that, and the deployment
- of PIRC FLOs would be a matter for Mr Harrower.
- 14 Q. I appreciate it would be a matter for him but I am
- 15 wondering whether, in your arrangements to schedule the
- autopsy, you took into account the need for the PIRC and
- 17 the police between them to notify Mr Bayoh's family of
- the death, to appoint FLOs, for the FLOs to meet with
- 19 the family and explain the necessity for the
- 20 post mortem; whether you factored in the need for these
- 21 things to happen to the schedule that you had put
- in place?
- 23 A. Well, I made both Police Scotland and Mr Harrower aware
- of the arrangements. They expressed no concern about
- 25 that. I would have anticipated that the police would

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 have contacted Mr Bayoh's family and given a death message really as soon as they possibly could. Now, 2 3 there are difficulties with a death message because 4 the amount of information that is available in the 5 circumstances may be a problem but you still need to tell them that this has happened. I fully anticipated 6 7 and expected that PIRC would make themselves known to the family and explain the circumstances and explain the 8 9 need for a post mortem and the timetabling of that 10 post mortem at the earliest opportunity. Q. So those were your expectations, both of the police and 11 12 of the PIRC, but was there any discussion on the morning 13 of the 3rd with Craig Blackhall from the Professional 14 Standards Department within Police Scotland or 15 Mr Harrower from the PIRC as to what your expectations 16 were? Certainly not with Craig Blackhall, I didn't -- I don't 17 Α. think I discussed anything further with him, to be 18 frank. But I certainly had discussions with 19

think I discussed anything further with him, to be frank. But I certainly had discussions with Keith Harrower and he would have been in no doubt that my expectations were that the family would be told about this at the earliest possible time, and made aware of the arrangements for the post mortem and asked if they would be willing to attend to identify Mr Bayoh. It had happened that way in so many other cases, to be honest.

- 1 Keith Harrower with his experience -- and he and I worked together on a number of different 2 3 investigations -- I don't know there was a need to go 4 into it in any sort of great detail, which is probably 5 why I don't have a memory of it. I think you said a moment ago in your evidence that 6 Q. 7 certainly no concerns were expressed by Mr Harrower --8 Α. No. 9 -- when you advised him of the arrangements for the Q. 10 autopsy --11 Α. No. 12 Q. -- around the timetabling? 13 I do recall there was some discussion with Keith about Α. 14 timetabling. That may have been right at the very, very 15 beginning where I was saying to him that I wanted this post mortem as quickly as possible and we needed to know 16 17 why this man had died while in the custody of the police officers. But I don't recall any further detail than 18 19 that. I seem to recall, and I will be corrected if I am wrong, 20 Q. 21 that he may have given evidence that there had been 22 a discussion around the possibility of the autopsy
- 25 A. It's possible that that took place. If Keith says it,

of that is not possible?

23

24

taking place on the 3rd, and he had said no, in respect

- 1 I have no reason to doubt it at all. It may well be the case that I said to him in the earliest conversation 2 3 that I would need to find out about mortuary space and 4 the availability of pathologists but it might be that we 5 could do it today and if we can that is a possibility 6 and that might be an idea. 7 Again, this was about finding out why he had died, excluding natural causes, trying to find out, you know, 8
- Again, this was about finding out why he had died,

 excluding natural causes, trying to find out, you know,

 what had brought about his death. As I have indicated

 earlier, it seemed to me imperative that we do this as

 quickly as possible, and historically we did do such

 post mortems at weekends, and indeed sometimes late at

 night. Had Dr Shearer volunteered that or offered that,

 I would certainly not have discounted it.
 - Q. Did Dr Shearer express any concern around the timescale for the autopsy?
- 17 A. Not at all.

15

- 18 Q. Can I read to you please a passage from her evidence.
- I don't know whether you have followed any of the evidence --
- 21 A. No, I haven't. Since I retired I have been abroad most 22 of the time.
- Q. This won't come up on the screen because it's from the transcript evidence but I will read it out to you. This is what she said:

Ι		"Answer: I remember it was a very dynamic situation
2		and there was insistence for the post mortem to be done
3		as quickly as possible."
4		She was asked:
5		"Question: I wonder if you could explain a little
6		bit more about that for the Chair?"
7		And she said:
8		"Answer: I remember at the time because I took the
9		phone call on the Sunday and already there was a lot of
10		media interest, there was a lot of information kind of
11		already out there, and there was obviously questions
12		because there had been police involvement as well. So
13		I do remember there being a reasonable amount of stress
14		surrounding that, and also a reasonable amount
15		of pressure to get the post mortem done as quickly as
16		possible. But bearing in mind these sorts of
17		post mortems I would have done as quickly as possible
18		anyway but I do remember because of the circumstances
19		surrounding the case there was pressure that I have
20		never felt before."
21		Can you offer any comment on that?
22	Α.	I don't know what sort of pressure she is talking about.
23		I wasn't aware of any media or anything of that nature.
24		Quite frankly I was too busy doing my job to be paying
25		any attention whatever to what the media might be saying

or otherwise and I can say without a shadow of a doubt

I at no time looked at the media or was aware of the

media during the whole course of that day.

She may have felt pressure because she was seeing things on the media and was thinking: goodness gracious me, I am being asked to do this post mortem in what is obviously a high profile case. I can't comment on that. She certainly didn't get any pressure from me. It was a perfectly ordinary, reasonable conversation with someone I have known for many years, I gave her such information as I had at the time about what had taken place, I certainly obviously told her that Mr Bayoh was black, which is why there was the Quasar conversation, and I expressed view that this was likely to become very high profile, and that was another reason why I wanted this done as quickly as possible. But I certainly applied no pressure whatever to Dr Shearer.

Q. Thank you. I want to move on to ask some questions now around identification of the body, and I wonder if we can turn to page 6 of your statement. Paragraph 4:

"Late that night, about 23.30 I think, I was advised by PIRC that the family had indicated they would not attend the mortuary to identify Mr Bayoh. I instructed that the post mortem should proceed as arranged. My reasons for this were that in my view it was essential

1 to ascertain the cause of Mr Bayoh's death as soon as possible. There were many possible causes, I thought 2 3 the most likely would be postural asphyxia with 4 cardiopulmonary arrest but there were other 5 possibilities such as a drug-related cause or natural cause due to a medical condition. I had been made aware 6 7 at some point that Mr Bayoh had consumed drugs and that there were no bleeding injuries found at the hospital. 8 9 In my opinion it was necessary in the public interest for the post mortem to proceed to inform the nature and 10 direction of the investigation. All arrangements were 11 12 in place and his identity could be confirmed at a later stage. The body could be identified by PIRC staff." 13 14 So who was it you spoke with that evening? Would it 15 have been Mr Harrower? Is this perhaps what you referred to at the very outset of your evidence, that it 16 17 wasn't Pat Campbell you had the conversation with, it may have been Keith Harrower? 18 19 Indeed, it was definitely Keith Harrower. Α. 20 So you spoke with Keith Harrower. And you were advised Q. 21 that the family had indicated they would not attend. 22 Who did you understand the family to be? I assumed that Mr Harrower and his colleagues would be 23 Α. in contact with the nearest relatives. I assumed the 24 family were the nearest relatives. I had no reason to 25

1 question that, to be frank. At the time I had no 2 awareness of who the family might be or how many of them 3 there might be, who they comprised, who the next of kin 4 was; I had no knowledge of that at all. 5 You say: Q. 6 "... I was advised by PIRC that the family had 7 indicated they would not attend the mortuary to identify Mr Bayoh." 8 9 Do you see that there? 10 Α. Yes. What I would like to do is just hold that thought but 11 Q. 12 perhaps move on to your second statement to compare what 13 is said there. If we can look at your second statement, 14 please, and it's in the numbered paragraphs which are 15 towards the back of the statement. I am looking for 16 paragraph 42, please. This is quite a long paragraph, 17 it might be easier if you can find paragraph 43 please because it is towards the end. If we can scroll to the 18 19 top of that page. That would be perfect. Thank you 20 very much. So here -- are you with me Mr Green? 21 Α. Yes. 22 At the top of the page that has paragraph 43 towards the Q. bottom, in the second paragraph from the top you say: 23 24 "I ensured that the family were advised of the time and place of autopsy and that they were asked if they 25

1 would attend and identify him. There was no obligation 2 on them to do so. 3 "I was advised that the family were not willing to 4 attend the mortuary and that they were waiting for 'elders' to travel from, I believe, London. Moreover, 5 I was advised that the family would consider this 6 7 request once they arrived. "Thus, there was no timeframe for this to occur nor 8 any certainty that the family would ever attend to 9 10 identify the body. "In the face of this uncertainty and the necessity, 11 12 in my view, of conducting the autopsy as soon as 13 possible I decided it should go ahead as arranged." 14 I want to be absolutely clear with you, Mr Green, 15 your understanding of the family's position because in your first statement you say: 16 17 "... I was advised by the PIRC that the family had indicated that they would not attend the mortuary to 18 identify Mr Bayoh." 19 20 But here you refer to the family not being willing 21 to attend, waiting for elders to travel from London, and that they would consider the request once they arrived. 22 So they seem to be slightly different things to me. 23 It's a matter for the Chair at the end of the day, but 24 I wonder if you could confirm what your understanding 25

was on the 3rd, whether it was the family were not
willing to identify or whether they were waiting for
elders to travel from England and that they would
consider the request when they arrived?

A. My understanding at the time was they were not willing to attend at that point and identify, that they were waiting for elders. And I remember the word being used and it struck me as an unusual word, I didn't quite understand what it meant, but that was of no moment.

They were certainly waiting for others to come to Kirkcaldy, and that there would be a discussion, presumably with those individuals who had arrived and those who were already present in Kirkcaldy, about whether or not they would attend to identify Mr Bayoh's body.

Thus there was this total uncertainty, and as I have indicated earlier, the family do not have to go and identify. It's a request of them. It is not something that they can be compelled to do, and not infrequently families say: I don't want to go, I am not prepared to go, no one in the family is going. So there was for me this difficulty that had I -- it was obvious when I had the conversation with Keith Harrower he was advising me of the situation and waiting for me to make a decision. He didn't offer any views as to what the best course of

action might be, not that I would have expected him to,
I knew it was my decision to take. And it seemed to me
that in light of that uncertainty about when people
would arrive, when discussions might take place, when
discussions might conclude, it was totally unknown as to
whether that would go way into the course of the week,
that days might elapse.

I had to take a decision. Had I decided to delay potentially I would have been criticised by others for so doing. There was the potential to be criticised by the forensic pathologists, by colleagues in Crown Office et cetera, and I came to the conclusion that the proper thing to do in the interests of justice was to carry on with the post mortem as discussed, organised and agreed.

- Q. So you explain that there was no timeframe and that left you with an uncertainty as to when the family were going to arrive, and indeed whether they would, even following their arrival, wish to attend for the purposes of identification. Did you ask Mr Harrower when the elders were going to be arriving from London?
- A. My recollection is that he didn't know. I don't recall that part of the conversation specifically, but I do recall thinking: oh my gosh, I have no idea when this is going to occur. And that, I felt, was a problem because, as I indicated earlier, knowledge and

25

1 understanding of what had brought about Mr Bayoh's death was the foundation upon which PIRC would build their 2 investigation. Without that, it was hard to see what 3 4 they were investigating or how they were setting about 5 it. Did you ask him to make enquiries with the family to see 6 Q. 7 if any more information could be obtained about the travel arrangements and the timeframe? 8 Given the time of night I did not. But what I did do 9 Α. 10 was ask that the family be revisited the following day in the hope that they could be persuaded to go and 11 12 identify. Not that that particularly mattered. 13 I should also say that, you know, the family could have 14 gone to see Mr Bayoh at any point in time, so it wasn't 15 necessary for them to see him before the post mortem and that is a cut off and they never get to see him again. 16 It is always possible for families to go to the mortuary 17 18 and to visit a loved one while they are still within the 19 mortuary, and indeed once remains are released to 20 nearest relatives, to do so in a funeral parlour or in 21 other circumstances. 22 So yes, it was a difficult decision. Given the time of night I didn't feel there was anyone that I could 23 really contact to discuss it with, so I ... thought it 24

through, I have to say quite quickly, and came to the

- view that that was the right decision to take and that
 was the instruction I gave.
- Q. You said that at this point in time you didn't know much about the family, you didn't know who they were, how many family members there were or who was the next of kin. Can I take it then you were not aware of that Mr Bayoh had a partner with whom he had a baby?
- 8 A. I had no knowledge of that.

- Q. I think it must follow then that you wouldn't have had any information about her views in relation to identifying his body?
- A. I am just thinking about this. I should clarify I think
 I was told on the Sunday that there was a partner with
 a baby but I was certainly never told what his partner's
 views were about identification or anything else.
 I simply was aware that there was a partner and a child.
 - Q. We will maybe look at her evidence later this morning but if you had been told on the evening of the 3rd that Mr Bayoh had a partner and that she was willing and able to identify the body, what would you have done?
 - A. I would have instructed Mr Harrower not to go and see
 her at that time given the lateness of the hour but
 certainly to go and see her in the early hours of the
 following day in the hope that she would agree to attend
 at the mortuary, identify Mr Bayoh and matters could

```
1
             proceed as arranged. I had no knowledge who it was that
             Mr Harrower had met with at all.
 2
 3
         LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson, would it be convenient to take
 4
             the break now?
         MS THOMSON: I think it would be. Thank you.
 5
         LORD BRACADALE: We will break for 20 minutes.
 6
 7
         (11.28 am)
                                (A short break)
 8
 9
         (11.55 am)
10
         LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson.
         MS THOMSON: Mr Green, shortly before the break when we were
11
12
             talking about the arrangement for the identification of
13
             the body you said, and I am quoting here now from
14
             a printed copy of the morning's [draft] transcript:
15
                 "Answer: ... the family could have gone to see
             Mr Bayoh at any point in time, so it wasn't necessary
16
17
             for them to see him before the post mortem and that is
18
             a cut-off and they never get to see him again. It is
19
             always possible for families to go to the mortuary and
20
             to visit a loved one while they are still within the
21
             mortuary, and indeed once remains are released to
22
             nearest relatives, to do so in a funeral parlour or in
23
             other circumstances."
24
                 So you were drawing to the Inquiry's attention the
             potential for the family to see Mr Bayoh's body at
25
```

- a later point in time, not necessarily prior to the
- 2 autopsy but at some point after the autopsy, and you are
- 3 explaining that was always a possibility?
- 4 A. Yes, indeed, and it happens frequently. The mortuaries
- 5 are quite well geared up to that kind of thing, and the
- 6 EPTs, the pathology technicians, are exceptionally
- 7 skilled in making bodies presentable for viewing.
- 8 Q. We have heard evidence already that there is a viewing
- 9 suite at the Edinburgh mortuary --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- with a glass screen with curtains where the body can
- be prepared and family members can view from the other
- side of that glass screen?
- 14 A. That would be usual prior to a post mortem where the
- death was suspicious. The reason for having families
- and others view from behind the glass partition is to
- 17 prevent them perhaps rushing forward and interacting
- 18 with the body and potentially cross-contaminating in
- 19 some way. After the post mortem is concluded all the
- 20 samples have been taken so there is nothing to prevent
- 21 the family touching, holding, whatever they wish by way
- of interaction with the deceased.
- Q. You will appreciate through your experience as a Fiscal
- that an autopsy is an invasive procedure.
- 25 A. Yes, I have been present at very many.

- Q. Do you understand that it's a procedure that is deeply resented by people of the Muslim faith?
- 3 A. Indeed.

22

23

24

- Q. Would you understand that even those who are not of the

 Muslim faith might find the prospect of viewing a body

 after that invasive procedure has been performed upon it

 to be traumatic, difficult, that they might have

 a preference to view the body before the procedure is

 carried out?
- 10 Α. My experience shows that those who are grieving can adopt all sorts of different positions, and you know 11 12 some want nothing to do with it, some complain they are 13 not allowed to touch before, some complain they are 14 asked to view. I well understand that that may well be 15 the situation, but in my experience no nearest relatives 16 or very few nearest relatives ever wish to have their 17 loved ones subject to a post mortem, I have been 18 complained about for refusing a post mortem but that was 19 a rather unusual situation. The vast majority of times 20 people do not want this to occur, no matter what their 21 faith or religion is.
 - Q. You said in your evidence just a few moments ago that
 the reason for the glass screen is to prevent, prior to
 the autopsy taking place, the deceased's loved ones from
 potentially rushing forward and interfering in some way

1 that could be problematic from an evidential 2 perspective? Indeed. 3 Α. 4 Q. And that it is your understanding that once the autopsy 5 has been performed, that concern falls away and there is not a need for a family to view from behind a glass 6 7 screen? That's correct. 8 Α. Is that your evidence? 9 Q. 10 Now, the Inquiry has heard evidence that some members of Sheku Bayoh's family attended the mortuary, 11 12 a few days later, I think on the 6th from memory, for 13 the purposes of not a formal identification but to view 14 the body, and they were invited to do so from behind the 15 glass screen. The curtains were opened, and they viewed the body from behind the glass screen. They were not 16 17 presented with the option of being able to approach his body in the same room, touch his body, kiss his body. 18 19 Does that surprise you? 20 I have no real knowledge of how the Edinburgh mortuary Α. 21 organises those family visits. I would say from 22 a Fiscal's perspective there is nothing whatever to prevent them from interacting by touching, kissing, or 23 whatever the body. I simply don't know what 24 25 arrangements they have in place at Edinburgh, because to

- 1 all intents and purposes as Procurator Fiscal once I have had the post mortem, once the post mortem has 2 3 concluded, then my intent is to release that body as 4 quickly as I possibly can back to the family, and I am 5 not actually concerned what is happening with it. So I can't say I have ever made enquiry as to how they 6 7 organise these things in the Lawnmarket but there is certainly no reason why they can't interact with the 8 9 body, there is -- any evidence that might be recovered 10 has been recovered and the body will have been washed and prepared by the EPTs, so I am sorry I can't really 11 12 comment beyond that.
 - But from your perspective as a Fiscal there would be no Q. reason why a family should not be able to approach their loved one, touch and kiss the body after the autopsy has taken place and all evidence has been ingathered and samples have been taken?
- 18 Absolutely. Α.

13

14

15

16

17

21

19 Thank you. Returning to the evidence that you gave Q. 20 shortly before the break, I had asked you to confirm your understanding of the family's position as at the 22 evening of the 3rd and I asked you to do that because there was a subtle but potentially important difference 23 between your first statement and your second statement 24 on that point. Again, quoting from the [draft] 25

transcript you said: 1 "Answer: My understanding at the time was that they 2 were not willing to attend at that point and identify. 3 4 That they were waiting for elders ..." 5 And you said something about the use of that word: "... to come to Kirkcaldy and that there would be 6 7 a discussion, presumably with those individuals who had arrived and those who were already present in Kirkcaldy, 8 about whether or not they would attend to identify 9 10 Mr Bayoh's body. Thus there was this total uncertainty~..." 11 12 So that was your evidence before the break, that 13 the family were not willing to attend at that point in 14 time for the purposes of identification, that they were 15 waiting for elders to arrive and when they arrived there would be a discussion around whether or not they would 16 17 attend to view the body. And there was an uncertainty, so far as you were concerned, as to the timescale for 18 19 these people arriving and this decision being made. Yes, I have amplified my first statement in the second 20 Α. 21 statement and the second statement is the position. 22 Thank you for confirming that. What I would like to do Q. now, and I appreciate you have told us that since your 23 retirement you have not been following Public Inquiries, 24 which of course are live streamed. I would like to 25

1 share with you some of the evidence that the Inquiry has heard that bears on this issue, really just for the 2 3 purposes of putting it to you for your comment and I may 4 have some questions around it. 5 I would like to begin with the evidence that we heard from Kadi Johnson. That is Mr Bayoh's sister. 6 7 She described being visited by a person who she thought was a FLO but it was in fact Keith Harrower on the 8 9 evening of 3 May. So I am going to quote from the 10 transcript, again I'm afraid this doesn't come up on the screen. But I will read it out. If you want me to 11 12 repeat anything, just say: 13 "Answer: He said, 'Are you ready to come down to the 14 hospital to identify the body?' That is how he said it. 15 "Question: And what was your reply? "Answer: I said 'No'. I said, 'His mother is in 16 17 London and I am arranging for her to come up tomorrow', that was the Monday. I said once she is here she would 18 19 want to see her son as well and we will go and identify 20 the body. 21 "Question: Did you make it clear to that person that 22 you would go the next day once Sheku's mother was in Kirkcaldy? 23 "Answer: I told them that our Mum was coming on the 24 next day and we can arrange to see the body then, yes. 25

1	"Question: And when you explained to the person you
2	think is from PIRC, the family liaison officer, that
3	Sheku's Mum would be travelling up the next day, did you
4	make it clear that you would be willing to identify the
5	body once she arrived in Scotland?
6	"Answer: Mm-hmm, yes. It was clear that we will
7	identify the body once my Mum was here. That was made
8	clear.
9	"Question: So you were willing to identify the body?
LO	"Answer: Yes, yes. We were willing to identify the
11	body. The only thing we asked for is to wait for my
12	Mum. That is all we asked for.
13	"Question: Right. Did you make that clear to the
L 4	PIRC?
15	"Answer: Yes.
16	"Question: So when this conversation was concluded,
L7	what was your understanding of the position about
L8	identifying the body?
19	"Answer: I thought they accepted our request and
20	they will wait for our Mum to come and then we can
21	arrange to go and see the body."
22	I appreciate you haven't heard that before but that
23	is the evidence that Kadi Johnson gave to this Inquiry.
24	It's a matter for the Chair but if the Chair accepts her
25	evidence as to what she said to Mr Harrower, then it

- 1 would suggest that Mr Harrower understood that the
- 2 family were willing to attend --
- 3 A. Yes, clearly.
- Q. -- to identify the body, and indeed that Sheku's mother
- 5 wanted to see his body?
- 6 A. Indeed.
- 7 Q. And that they wanted to wait for his mother to travel
- 8 from London and that she would be arriving the next day.
- 9 That was all in Kadi's evidence.
- 10 A. Yes, absolutely, yes indeed.
- 11 Q. It's entirely a matter for the Chair but if he were to
- 12 accept her evidence that she said these things to
- 13 Mr Harrower, then it would follow that there was really
- 14 no uncertainty or ambiguity as to their position, their
- position was quite clear. Would you agree with that?
- A. Well, it certainly was not made clear to me.
- 17 Q. That is another matter and we will come to that, but if
- 18 we can stay with Kadi Johnson's evidence for now --
- 19 A. Yes, I totally accept what you say, and frankly had that
- information been conveyed to me, while I wouldn't have
- done anything at 12.30 or 11.30 at night, I would
- 22 certainly have used my phone from the car the following
- 23 day to try to organise a post mortem for the Tuesday and
- 24 put it back given that there is a clear indication that
- 25 Sheku's mother is going to attend and that they are

- willing to attend the mortuary. But that was not made known to me at all.
- Q. So you accept on the basis of the evidence of

 Kadi Johnson which I have shared with you today that it

 gave a clear indication that Sheku's mother was willing

 to attend to identify the body and she would be arriving

 the following day?
- 8 A. Yes.

18

- 9 Q. So there was no ambiguity as to her position and no uncertainty about the timeframe; would that be fair?
- A. Well, it is not a matter for me to assess whether what

 she says is accurate. On the basis of what you are

 putting to me, indeed that is the case. And as I have

 indicated, had that been made to clear to me, had I been

 made aware of any of that I would have sought to put

 this back for a day to allow his mother to attend the

 mortuary.
 - Q. And your very clear position in your evidence is that this was not made known to you?
- A. Absolutely not. I don't actually recall mention of his
 mother at all. What stuck in my mind was the use of the
 word "elders". I didn't ... we are talking
 a conversation at 11.30 at night, I am due to be up and
 on my way to Abernyte in Perth by 6 the following
 morning, I am not digging into it, I am accepting the

1 information that I am given at face value because I expect it to be accurate. 2 Q. Okay, thank you. 3 4 So that was Kadi Johnson's evidence and I simply 5 wanted to put it to you -- I appreciate you haven't heard it before today -- I wanted to put it to you for 6 7 your comment. I wonder if we can look now at Mr Harrower's evidence and if we can look perhaps at his 8 9 Inquiry statements, which is SBPI 00259. At 10 paragraph 55: "After explaining to the family regarding the PIRC 11 12 role and function, I then advised the family that COPFS 13 had made arrangements for a post mortem examination on 14 the afternoon of Monday 4 May." 15 Sorry, I should have said this is a conversation he is having with the family on 3 May. 16 Yes, I understand. 17 Α. 18 "I asked for two family members to make themselves Q. 19 available to attend the city mortuary in Edinburgh to 20 identify the body. My operational notes, at page 9, 21 state that 'Ade indicated stated the family had 22 discussed matters, and no representatives were willing to do the identification until family members, including 23 the now deceased's mother attended ~... She was 24 travelling with a group, including elders from England'. 25

My understanding of this was that the family were 1 refusing to do the identification in the timescale 2 3 outlined. I don't think it was the intention that it 4 would be the mother that would do the identification, 5 but that they were not willing to participate in that process until she arrived~... I'm aware she was 6 7 travelling from down south or was about to travel. I don't have any recollection of being advised as to 8 9 when she would arrive. I got the impression she was in 10 the process of travelling but I don't think established where she was actually coming from other than it was 11 12 somewhere in England. I think it was suggested that 13 they would arrive at some time the following day, which 14 was the Monday, and obviously the post mortem was 15 arranged for midday on the Monday. I have been asked if the family understood that I was [it was] the Crown's 16 17 decision as to the timing of the post mortem. Yes, I think so. I'd explained specifically it was the 18 Crown's decision. My statement records that Mr Johnson 19 20 wasn't willing to be more specific on the expected 21 arrangements of the arrival of the family members etc. That part of the conversation was closed down." 22 Again, it is entirely a matter for the Chair at the 23 end of the day but can I suggest we see here that this 24 is entirely consistent with what Kadi Johnson said in 25

her evidence, that there wasn't a refusal to identify,

there was a willingness to identify but a request that

the post mortem procedure be delayed to allow that -- to

allow the mother and elders to travel from England.

Would you agree with that?

A. Yes.

Q. I wonder if we can -- if I can take you now to you what Mr Harrower said in his evidence, again I am reading from the transcript so this won't come up on the screen. But he was asked about the conversation on the 3rd, the conversation that he had with you on the 3rd, late in the evening. And your position, as set out in your first statement, which I appreciate you finessed in your second statement, the position you set out in your first statement was put to him for comment, in response to which he said:

"Answer: I am fairly confident that I told him [that is you] regarding the expected visitors travelling and that there would be no decision finally made on that until they had arrived."

So basically accurately summarising the discussion with Mr Johnson in relation to the arrangement for the post mortem. But I understand from what you said before I took you to these transcripts that your position is that it was not made clear to you that the mother would

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be travelling the following day and that she wished to

identify the body?

- I was given no timeframe for her attending, and in 3 Α. particular I was never told that she would wish to view 4 5 the body. My recollection is clear, that they were unwilling to attend at that time, that they were waiting 6 7 for the arrival of others, that there would then be some discussion and there was no indication given to me that 8 9 the family wished to go to the -- to see Mr Bayoh, nor 10 that they would be willing to do so or to carry out an identification. As I said earlier, they don't have 11 12 to do that, it is a request of them. They could refuse. 13 So that left me in a position where it was completely 14 uncertain, so far as I was concerned, as to when this 15 post mortem might take place if I delayed it.
 - Q. You explained before the break that in those circumstances you came to the decision that the proper course was to proceed with the autopsy on the 4th as planned?
 - A. Well, indeed. And one of things I do remember thinking at the time was having dealt with lots of Muslim deaths in the past, while I knew that they didn't wish post mortems they were accepting of them when we said that we required to do them, but the one thing they always emphasised was that they wanted it done as

I was made aware of.

- quickly as possible and they wanted the remains back
 with the family as quickly as possible, so I took
 account of that as well, and frankly I thought I was
 doing the right thing on the basis of the information
- Q. Let's stay with that thought for a moment, please, when you said "they", I think you are perhaps referring to people from the Muslim faith?
- 9 A. Yes.

5

10

11

12

- Q. Like to have an autopsy -- if it has to be done it should be done as soon as possible because burial should take place as soon as possible?
- 13 Absolutely, hence the need to return the body to the Α. 14 family as quickly as is practicable. I used to liaise 15 very frequently with the Central Mosque in Glasgow because it was directly across Ballater Street, the 16 17 Fiscal's office there, which was where I was based. And 18 I had many discussions with individuals in the mosque 19 and very much understood that time was of the essence, 20 and they wanted things to be progressed as quickly as we 21 possibly could, assuming we required to do 22 a post mortem. And indeed I can say that myself and my staff very frequently were in touch with the mortuaries 23 and the pathologists to say can you expedite this 24 because of the religious requirements. So it was very 25

- firmly in my mind at that time.
- 2 Q. I wondered if we can look briefly at your second
- 3 statement towards the very end, paragraph 77. Where you
- 4 emphasise much the same point as you have made now in
- 5 your evidence.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. You say you understood Mr Bayoh was Muslim:
- 8 "... and though I don't recall from whom I received
- 9 that information or when I certainly considered it as
- 10 possibility hence my concern to ensure as far as
- 11 possible that the post mortem process proceeded as
- 12 expeditiously as possible in order that his remains be
- 13 released to his family at the earliest point."
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. So you have explained that you made the assumption that
- that is what the family would desire on the basis of
- their faith, and that is based on your own understanding
- of Muslim burial requirements and your own experience,
- and in particular your experience in Glasgow of working
- 20 with the local mosque?
- 21 A. Indeed.
- Q. I think you said -- I don't have the transcript of your
- 23 evidence in front of me but you said a moment ago that
- 24 that decision or that assumption was well intended or
- 25 well meaning, or words to that effect?

1	Α.	Absolutely. My thought and indeed my hope was that if
2		we could conclude the post mortem on the Monday,
3		Mr Bayoh's remains would be released to the family
4		potentially on the Tuesday, possibly the Wednesday, but
5		within that sort of timeframe. That is what I was
6		really trying to achieve.
7	Q.	I would like to share some further information with you
8		from the evidence, and again this comes from
9		Keith Harrower. He was asked:
10		"Question: Would there have been any reason why you
11		couldn't have asked David Green to delay the
12		post mortem?"
13		He said:
14		"Answer: To be honest it's not for me to interfere
15		in that process. I am unaware of how what the
16		availability of the appropriate people are, including
17		the pathologist, what was available, whether that day or
18		further ahead in the timescale. It is not for me. He
19		was aware of all of the circumstances that were relevant
20		in relation to the scheduling of that.
21		"Question: Can you explain why you didn't choose to
22		give your opinion to David Green about perhaps delaying
23		or deferring the post mortem until the mother had
24		arrived?
25		"Answer: As I say, I didn't know what the

1 alternatives were. Again, that wouldn't be something that I would ask him, he is a very senior member of the 2 Crown Office and I didn't feel it was my position to 3 4 push for any sort of alternative. He was armed with all 5 the relevant information on the feelings of the family in relation to that and he has clearly had uppermost in 6 7 his mind as regards finding out medically what caused the death, which was very important for the 8 investigation moving forward, so I chose not to pursue 9 10 anything else in relation to those arrangements. He knew what the facts were." 11 12 Looking back given the evidence that you have given this morning would you agree with Mr Harrower's 13 statement that you knew what the facts were? 14 15 Well, plainly not. I had no idea that the family had Α. been expressing the wishes that you put to me earlier, 16 17 I had no idea whatever that his mother wished to see him 18 and that they were willing to attend to identify. That 19 was not the position as I understood it, it is not what 20 was said to me. So -- and as I have indicated, had 21 I been made aware of that I would have sought to put 22 back the post mortem. Q. Do you have any comment to make on Mr Harrower's feeling 23 24 that it wasn't for him to urge you to push the 25 post mortem back, it wasn't for him to ask for a delay

to that procedure? 1 2 I have to say that I am slightly surprised. I had quite Α. 3 a lot of interactions with Mr Harrower, even when he was 4 a police officer. I would say I knew him reasonably 5 well and had certainly quite a lot of contact with him when he was in PIRC. He is quite a forceful character, 6 7 he isn't backward about expressing his views. I don't doubt that, you know, he would have felt perfectly able 8 9 to express his views to me but he certainly did no such 10 thing. I would have welcomed his is views, to be frank. He has had interaction with the family. I am remote 11 12 from the family, I am remote from what is going on, so 13 it would have been helpful to me to have that input. But he offered no input at all. 14 15 Q. Can we return to your first statement, please, and look at page 6, at the bottom of the page 6. Very bottom of 16 17 page 6 you say: "I understood that PIRC would approach the family 18 19 again the following morning to see if they had changed 20 their mind and would identify." 21 You have told us about that expectation already, 22 that contact would be made with the family in the morning. If we can look at the top paragraph on page 7 23 now, please. You will see there are some redactions 24 25 here, at least on the version on the screen. But you

1 left about 6 am on the 4th to travel somewhere and you returned home perhaps about 19.00 hours: 2 3 "During that time I had no contact or calls in 4 relation to Mr Bayoh's death and it follows that I issued no instructions." 5 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. So you had understood that the PIRC would approach the family again the following morning to see if there had 8 9 been any change to their position. Had you expected to be updated as to the outcome of that discussion? 10 My recollection of this is that I asked that they go 11 Α. 12 back and ask the family to see if they would change 13 their minds and would identify. That I think is 14 supportive of what I have said about the information 15 that I understood at the time. Had there been this willingness to identify and had that been made known to 16 17 me, there would be no point in me sending PIRC back to ask the family again, but I specifically recall 18 19 saying: look, it's late at night, go back and see them 20 tomorrow morning, see if they are willing to identify, 21 explain the post mortem is going to have to go ahead at that time, and asking them or giving them a second 22 opportunity to do that. 23 24 Now, as I say I think that indicates the information that I was given and is supportive of the fact that 25

1 nobody told me they were willing to attend. That was not the information that I was given. 2 3 So, yes, I definitely recall giving Keith Harrower an instruction to that effect. And as for whether 4 5 I expected him to contact me or someone to contact me to tell me what had transpired, yes, but at the same time 6 7 colleagues -- senior colleagues had then become involved. Stephen McGowan was involved, John Logue, 8 9 again a senior colleague, had become involved. They 10 were both aware that I had been deployed to Perthshire to a DVI body recovery, so I expected that they would be 11 12 getting involved and potentially information would have 13 been given to them. What I can certainly say is that 14 while I was exceptionally busy on that Monday, I did not 15 receive any calls at all about this matter. 16 We see that set out at the end of that top paragraph on Q. 17 the page: 18 "During that time I had no contact or calls in 19 relation to Mr Bayoh's death and it follows I issued no 20 instructions." 21 Α. Not that I recall and I certainly issued no further 22 instructions. My view was that in light of the circumstances as I understood them the matter should go 23 ahead at 12 noon. 24 25 Q. Again, can I share with you some of the evidence that we

1 have heard already. Again, I'm afraid I am reading from a transcript here. This is the evidence of 2 3 Billy Little. So on the 3rd Mr Harrower was the duty 4 SIO, and on the 4th Mr Little was appointed as the SIO. In his evidence he was asked about a section in his 5 statement which states that he was: 6 7 "... further advised during the events on 3 May the immediate family had intimated to Mr Harrower that they 8 9 did not wish the post mortem process to proceed and 10 asked that it be deferred for relatives and elders to attend from England. The family could not give a date 11 12 or time of arrival for such persons. This had been 13 passed to Crown Office but instructions had been given 14 that the post mortem would be taking place. The family 15 intimated they would not be engaging in this process. "I have been asked whether I ever dealt with 16 a request from the family regarding the timing of 17 a post mortem for religious or others reasons. My 18 recollection is that no, I haven't. 19 20 "I have been asked what I did with this request. I did have a discussion with the Crown, David Green, 21 22 about it in this instance. Keith had had some interaction with the family the night before. Although 23 I was appointing two family liaison officers to deal 24 with the family, but Keith had met the family so I asked 25

1 him to phone again and ask them again to engage with us 2 in the post mortem process. So although Keith had told 3 me they didn't want to be involved in the process, 4 I asked Keith to contact the family because they knew 5 who he was. While FLOs had been appointed, they had never met the families. What I got back from Keith was 6 7 no they are not engaging, they don't want the post mortem to go ahead. I phoned Dave Green at 8 9 Crown Office about that and David told me that the 10 post mortem was going ahead. I haven't recorded it anywhere but my recollection is his words were 'We need 11 12 to know how this man died'. So I can only ask the 13 Crown, I can only impart to the Crown the information. 14 It's the Crown's decision to hold the post mortem and 15 when that post mortem takes place and who undertakes the post mortem is not my decision. Dave Green wasn't 16 17 willing to delay the post mortem." 18 So again, can I invite your comment on that because Mr Little has given evidence that he was told by 19 20 Keith Harrower to make further contact -- he told 21 Keith Harrower to make further contact with the family 22 which he did, their response was fed back to him and he contacted you about it on the 4th. But you have told us 23 you had no recollection of having received any calls. 24 Does this jog your memory at all? 25

- 1 Α. I'm afraid it doesn't. I am not disputing it may have happened but, as I have indicated, I was involved in 2 3 travelling to and dealing with another incident. There 4 were many calls about all sorts of things. I certainly 5 do not recall that conversation. But if it happened, it wasn't something that was going to cause me to change my 6 7 instruction. Because there was still no suggestion of a time or a certainty that they would -- that they would 8 9 attend to identify. So without the benefit of my notes, 10 I can't even say that I made a note about this because I have no recollection of it at all. I can't give 11 12 another answer than that, I'm afraid. 13 Thank you. We have heard over the last couple of days Q. 14 from Kate Frame, who I think was a former Crown Office 15 colleague of yours? 16 Α. Yes. But in May of 2015 was the Police Investigations and 17 Q. Review Commissioner. She gave the following evidence, 18 19 she was asked:
- "Question: Sticking with the issue of independence,
 we have heard some evidence that connects to the
 post mortem that was carried out on Mr Bayoh.

 I appreciate this happened on 4 May, you said you were
 in the office for a brief period during that day.

 I think in your Inquiry statement you do say that you

1	had spoken to Dave Green from the Crown Office?
2	"Answer: Yes, Mr Green, yes.
3	"Question: And you were aware of the family's
4	wishes, that they wished his mother to come up from
5	London prior to identifying the body at a post mortem?
6	"Answer: Yes, my recollection is that it was family
7	members, I don't just recall it being tied to the mother
8	coming.
9	"Question: Was the mother to be part of a group of
10	others as well?
11	"Answer: Yes, I understood that to be the case.
12	"Question: How did you become aware of the family's
13	wishes?
14	"Answer: I think that information was shared with me
15	by Mr Little.
16	"Question: When was that, do you remember?
17	"Answer: That would be on the morning of the 4th."
18	Then there was a discussion about where and when the
19	call took place:
20	"Question: Tell us about your discussion with
21	Mr Green at Crown Office?
22	"Answer: Well, I was aware from Mr Little that
23	Crown Office, and I didn't know precisely who, had been
24	made aware of this issue and I wanted to ensure that he,
25	as head of the Deaths Unit of the circumstances so

1		that it can be considered.
2		"Question: What did you tell Mr Green?
3		"Answer: My recollection is that I told him that
4		the family had indicated they wanted other family
5		members present before the post mortem went ahead.
6		"Question: What was his response?
7		"Answer: I think he was trying to balance the need
8		for well, to see if a cause of death could be
9		ascertained against that. But the eventual outcome was
10		that the post mortem had been arranged by that time and
11		was to continue.
12		"Question: What efforts did you make to persuade him
13		to delay the post mortem?
14		"Answer: I tried well, I did explain to him that
15		the families wishes were for it to be delayed until the
16		other family members had arrived. Unfortunately there
17		was no indication of when that would happen, so
18		I suppose his view was how long was the post mortem to
19		be delayed for and we didn't have that information."
20		So do you recall now having had a conversation with
21		Kate Frame on the morning of the 4th? Does this assist
22		you at all?
23	Α.	No, I'm afraid it doesn't. I have no recollection of
24		it. I have no reason to doubt that the conversation
25		took place. What I would say is that again on the

Mr Bayoh had died.

- 1 information that you have given me, I am not being given any additional information about when this -- when the 2 3 family might be available, when the post mortem might 4 take place. I think it is entirely conceivable that 5 I did say to Kate: no, there is no certainty here, it's going ahead as arranged because how long is this week 6 7 going to be? How long is a piece of string, in effect? I was -- as I have indicated earlier, I was 8 9 exceptionally conscious of the need to find out why
 - Q. This was of course an Article 2 investigation by the state bodies concerned. So the next of kin require to be involved in the procedure to the extent necessary to safeguard their legitimate interests. Would you agree with that?
- 16 A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

I am wondering in a case of this sort, where there are 17 Q. 18 competing interests -- and I understand that your 19 position is that you had no indication of timescale, 20 and indeed no clear indication that the family would 21 attend to identify the body at all. But there was 22 perhaps some suggestion that they were waiting for elders or family members to travel from London before 23 taking a decision. How did you go about balancing that 24 25 information against the competing interest of the

1 desirability of having a swift post mortem to ascertain the cause of death following a death in police custody; 2 3 how do you weigh up these interests? 4 Α. I think it is exceptionally difficult to do so and these 5 were exceptionally difficult circumstances. It is an Article 2 investigation, one of things that needs to 6 7 happen as well as is that it should be conducted as quickly as possible. It is an enormous -- it is very, 8 9 very, very difficult. It seemed to me that the quicker 10 we knew why it was that Mr Bayoh had died, the better it would be for the nearest relatives because they would 11 12 have some clarity and certainty. It might have been 13 that he had died of natural causes. There are lots of 14 possibilities as to how that might have come about. 15 There was plainly a need that PIRC were aware of how he had died, we were aware of how he had died and that the 16 17 investigation could progress. 18 It is an almost impossible balance. What I would 19 say again is this: had I been told that they were 20 willing to identify, had I been told that they were 21 en route or that this was likely to be a short delay, I would have taken a different decision. But that is 22 not the information that I was given and it is not the 23

Q. Of course. I understand that that is your evidence. So

basis upon which I proceeded.

24

25

- should we understand then that if you had been provided
 with that information and you had weighed that in the
 scales, against the desirability of a quick autopsy, the
 scales would have tipped in the other direction and you
 would have been willing to delay the autopsy until the
 Tuesday to allow for the family to attend and identify?
- 7 What I would say is this: had that been the case, Α. I would have been in contact with Dr Shearer to check 8 9 out the availability of mortuary spaces and pathology to 10 ensure that it was going to be the Tuesday and not pushed back a significant period of time. Had I been 11 12 given information that it would be pushed back further 13 I might well have insisted that it go ahead at that 14 time. So I would have sought more information. I did 15 not seek that information because that was not my 16 understanding.
 - Q. On the assumption that the autopsy could have been rescheduled for the Tuesday, possibly even the Wednesday --
- 20 A. I would have been happy to do that.

17

18

19

Q. I took you to Dr Shearer's evidence earlier this
morning, the evidence that she felt that the timeframe
put her under a degree of pressure. We have heard some
evidence that the PIRC were also feeling the pressure in
terms of the timescale. We have heard evidence from the

1		PIRC that by the time they had deployed and made their
2		way to Kirkcaldy Police Office it was about half past
3		one in the afternoon, there were only six of them, there
4		wasn't a FLO on duty over the weekend, a FLO, an
5		Alistair Lewis, was appointed at a briefing at 9 o'clock
6		on the Monday morning and by lunchtime on the Monday
7		still had not been able to make direct contact with the
8		family. So those were the circumstances, that was what
9		was happening behind the scenes at PIRC,
10		and I appreciate you wouldn't have had that information.
11	Α.	No, I wasn't aware of any of that.
12	Q.	I would like to share with you what Mr Little had to say
13		in relation to the post mortem. He said:
14		"Answer: If the post mortem had been delayed then
15		I could have had my family liaison officers meet with
16		the family, engage with the family, try to explain to
17		them in a controlled and calm environment about what is
18		going to happen, but the post mortem just went ahead.
19		"Question: Would your preference have been for the
20		post mortem to be delayed?
21		"Answer: I understand the rationale, as we needed to
22		identify as soon as possible the cause of death.
23		I understand the rationale for that but to balance that
24		against the family's wishes and the reasoning they gave,
25		sitting here now the post mortem should have been on the

1 Tuesday. 2 "Question: Would it have hindered your investigation 3 in any way if the post mortem had taken place the next 4 day?" And he said "No". Could I invite any comment you 5 might wish to make on that evidence? I appreciate your 6 7 understanding of the facts on the 3rd and 4th was different from his but would you wish to comment on that 8 9 at all? 10 Α. No, I don't see what comment I can usefully make. Let me share with you some evidence given by 11 Q. 12 Alistair Lewis. He was the FLO. As I mentioned a moment ago the Inquiry has heard evidence that there's 13 14 there were no FLOs on call over the weekend. He came on 15 duty at 8 o'clock in the morning of the Monday, the Monday morning, and was appointed as the FLO at 16 17 a briefing at 9 o'clock. I think we heard evidence too that Mr Harrower's 18 19 return call to the family was about half past ten in the 20 morning, and of course the autopsy was scheduled to take 21 place at midday. In between time, for one reason or 22 another, it hadn't come to pass that there had been an opportunity for Mr Harrower and Mr Little to 23 introduce the FLO to the family, for reasons that 24 needn't concern us this morning. 25

1 But what he did say the FLO, Mr Lewis, in his 2 evidence was this: "Answer: The time constraint created a challenge 3 that didn't need to be there." 4 5 He explained he started at 8 o'clock in the morning 6 had to get information, then he had to go and speak to 7 the family. He hadn't had that opportunity. He was asked if he had had that opportunity to speak with the 8 family, then perhaps the misunderstanding around their 9 10 position on identification that was clearly within the PIRC might have been uncovered and some action might 11 12 have been taken to allow the family to identify before 13 the post mortem took place, and he said yes he was 14 confident if he had had that interaction and spoken to 15 the family then he would have been able to resolve that 16 issue. 17 He was asked whether he was concerned on the morning 18 of the 4th that this perfect storm of events and the 19 timescale that he was working to and the difficulties he 20 was having making contact with the family were creating 21 a situation where he couldn't fulfil his 22 responsibilities in terms of the PIRC standard operating procedure on family liaison officers and he said he felt 23 the initiative had been lost: 24 25 "Answer: ... Making contact with the family,

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 interacting with the family, obtaining information, it's very important to speak with the family. 2 3 And he was asked: "Question: Did it occur to you to say to more senior 4 5 management, or indeed directly to the Fiscal: hang on here, it's half past ten, I am not long on duty, I have 6 7 just been briefed, I have just been appointed as the FLO, I have not met the family yet and if this 8 9 post mortem goes ahead at lunchtime I will not have the 10 opportunity to fulfil my responsibilities in terms of the policy to speak to the family about the need for the 11 12 post mortem, to speak to the family about the need for 13 identification and did it cross your mind on 4 May to 14 have that conversation?" 15 And he said: 16

"Answer: I wanted to have the conversation but
I didn't just want to go and say: I think we should be
doing this, [he] wanted to have more information from
the family first to present a better case."

I appreciate that you won't have heard any of this before but what I would like to ask you is this: if you had had a call from Alistair Lewis the FLO at say half past ten on the Monday morning and if he had said to you: look, I have been appointed as FLO less than two hours ago, I've not yet had the opportunity to meet

- the family, I haven't yet been able to establish contact
 with the family, I have got certain responsibilities in
 terms of our standard operating procedure, I need to
 introduce myself, I need to sit down with the family,
 I need to explain the need for an autopsy to take place,
 I need to explain the options around identification and
 I just cannot achieve this by midday, what would you
- 8 have done?
- I am slightly surprised it was so late in the day given 9 Α. 10 the timing of the post mortem was arranged long before that. But had he contacted me and expressed that view 11 12 I would certainly have taken some account of it. But no 13 such view was expressed. As I say, my understanding was 14 as set out in my second statement, and that gave me no 15 reason to believe that the family wished to identify or 16 the family wished to go to the mortuary, and that it was 17 simply a matter of delaying. As I have said earlier, had I been aware of that, I would have taken a different 18 19 decision.
- 20 Q. Hmm. No, I --
- A. It follows that I would have taken a different decision
 had the FLO approached me and explained these matters to

 me.
- Q. The issue around identification is perhaps a slightly different issue and your evidence on that is very clear

1 to me. From the FLO's perspective he felt that having come on duty at 8 o'clock having been appointed at 9.00, 2 3 having then had a briefing, having then spoken with 4 officers, as he was duty bound to do, who had already 5 had contact with the family and so on and so forth, having been updated by Mr Harrower at half past ten, the 6 7 clock was ticking, 12 o'clock was not far away. And I am simply wondering whether from -- if he had made 8 9 that call, leaving the identification issue to one side, 10 and if he had said to you: listen, I am just on duty, I have just been appointed, there are certain 11 12 requirements that are imposed on me in terms of our 13 family liaison standard operating procedure or policy, 14 and I am being thwarted in fulfilling these 15 responsibilities because the clock is ticking, I have 16 not managed to make contact with the family in spite of 17 my best efforts, I've not been able to sit down with 18 them and introduce myself, explain the need for the 19 autopsy, discuss identification with them; can you push 20 the autopsy back to give me the chance to do that? I am 21 wondering what you would have done? 22 I would certainly have taken account of it. But it Α. didn't happen. 23 For the avoidance of doubt, Mr Lewis didn't say that it 24 Q. did happen. He was quite clear that he hadn't made that 25

1 call and he hadn't made that ask. So I appreciate we are in hypothetical territory here, but I am simply keen 2 3 to explore if that call had been made and that 4 information had been brought to your door, that the PIRC 5 had been unable to fulfil their own obligations in terms of their own terms of reference, if you like, because of 6 7 the timescale, whether you would have considered delaying the autopsy? 8 A. I certainly would have considered it. The FLOs have 9 10 a very, very, very difficult job to do, and relationships with families are sometimes exceptionally 11 12 fraught, just because of the fact that you are dealing 13 with a death which has come suddenly and brings with it 14 all the issues you might anticipate. So had he asked me 15 on that basis, I would certainly have considered it. And I probably, given what I am being told now, would 16 17 have gone back to Dr Shearer to say: look, can 18 we backslide this a little bit. But no such request was 19 made. 20 Now, so far as I was concerned, PIRC were engaged 21 with the family, albeit that that engagement had --22 seemingly had been unproductive from the perspective of having someone to attend at the post mortem. I was 23 unaware that PIRC had not had FLOs out on the Sunday and 24

didn't have that process in place. So far as I was

25

1 concerned those were operational matters for PIRC, 2 I expected that they would have deployed FLOs. I can't say anything other than that. 3 4 Q. Can I tell you now a little about Collette Bell's 5 evidence. Again, you won't have heard this before. She 6 was of course Sheku Bayoh's partner and she was given 7 the death message on the morning of 5 May, and asked to give a statement immediately after the death message was 8 delivered to her. In her evidence she was asked about 9 10 the giving of that statement and she said the following. 11 She said: 12 "Answer: ... I would have to give a statement and 13 I said, 'I don't want to give a statement, I want to see Shek'. They said, you know, they understood it was 14 15 difficult but it was really important to try and get the statement so they could get all the information that 16 17 they needed to find out what had happened. I had said, 'No, I just want to see Shek, I just want to see Shek', 18 19 and I remember saying it over and over again, 'I don't 20 want to do anything, I just want to see Shek', and they 21 had said, 'If you get the statement done then we will see about you going to see him'." 22 She was asked: 23 "Question: What was your understanding of the 24 position?" 25

1 And she said: "Answer: Well, I thought I will do the statement and 2 3 then I will get to see him. They had said that he would 4 need to be identified anyway and they had said you will 5 get to see him, so if you get your statement done you 6 will get to see him because he needs to be identified 7 anyway." You already told us you had no knowledge really as 8 to who Sheku Bayoh's family were over the course of the 9 10 short period of time you were involved in the initial investigation of his death. But if you had been told on 11 12 the 3rd or even on the morning of the 4th that 13 Collette Bell had expressed a very strong desire to see 14 Shek and to identify his body, what steps might you have 15 taken? As I said earlier, when you asked a similar question, 16 17 had I been made aware that she was willing to attend and identify, I would have said that she should do that. 18 19 And that remains the position. But none of this was 20 known to me at all. I perhaps naively assumed that when 21 Mr Harrower said he was in contact with the family, that 22 he was in contact with all of those who one would consider from a Fiscal's perspective to be nearest 23 relatives. 24 So this is all news to me and puts a totally 25

- different complexion on it. But I was never told that

 she was willing to identify, nor that she wished to go

 and see the body.
 - Q. I appreciate this is all news to you. And these weren't matters that were necessarily within your knowledge at the time that you were involved in the investigation of this death. But looking back, might there have been a benefit in you asking more probing questions of Mr Harrower or did you consider that these were entirely operational matters for the PIRC? By that I mean liaison with the family, identifying who the family members were and making appropriate contact with them?
 - A. When I was advised that he had spoken to the family, as
 I have indicated I was of the clear view that he was
 referring to all of those nearest relatives. I didn't
 ask any probing questions because of the manner in which
 that was presented to me. Those are operational
 matters. I am not on the ground and it wouldn't be
 appropriate for me to be there, so I am relying on the
 information that is being passed to me and making
 judgements based on that. And as I have indicated now
 twice, all of these issues with Ms Bell are totally news
 to me, the first time I have heard them is today.
 - Q. Let's move on to the post mortem. That took place on Monday, 4th and you have explained in your statements,

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and we touched on it in evidence already, that

Bernard Ablett attended the post mortem as the Fiscal.

The PIRC also had a presence at the post mortem,

including Billy Little. Did you anticipate the police

attending the post mortem?

A. I recall some discussion with Keith Harrower about the

body being identified, potentially by a police officer who took control of the body in the Victoria Infirmary and then a member of PIRC staff who took over control from the police officer. That post mortem was under the control of PIRC. It's a matter entirely for PIRC as to who is there. It was just a quick discussion about where we might get some identification to ensure we were talking about the same person that had gone into the hospital, that had then gone to the City Mortuary, et cetera. I wouldn't have anticipated police officers being present at all other than potentially, as I say, the witness coming in to identify, but identification witnesses identify and are then sent away. They are not -- they don't have any other purpose in the process in the mortuary. I might have expected that some samples might require to be taken to the forensic lab and would be handed over to police officers potentially to transport them. But I can't see why police officers would have been present in the mortuary at all. It was

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- a PIRC investigation. They were in control of it. It
 had been handed over to them. I am surprised if there
 were police officers present.
- Q. For completeness, I think you say in your first

 statement at paragraph 69 -- I don't think there is

 a need to pull this up, it is in short compass -- that:

 "You would be unsurprised if the police were present

to assist with seizing productions and conveying samples
to laboratories but under the direction and control of
the PIRC."

Yes. To explain that, I wouldn't anticipate they would Α. be in the mortuary room, although I would anticipate that PIRC investigators would be, while the examination was carried out, and where there are labelled samples that require to be transmitted, they would taken out of there and handed over to police officers who would be in the building potentially but not within the mortuary suite. Because they have no purpose in being there. It's a PIRC investigation. And moreover, from my perspective, there was a potential we would end up with a police officer accused here but it was also possible we would end up with Police Scotland as an accused here. So I certainly anticipated all of those intimately engaged and involved with the process in the mortuary would be PIRC.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Q. We have heard evidence that there were a number of 2 police officers in attendance, including a DCI Hardie. 3 Does that give you any cause for concern? 4 Α. As I have indicated, it is not their investigation. 5 They were left to investigate what had occurred in the aftermath of this boxing match that I understood had 6 7 been watched. PIRC were instructed to investigate everything that occurred from the time the police were 8 9 made aware of Mr Bayoh's -- the allegations from members 10 of the public that were called in to them, from that point right through until he was conveyed to the 11 12 Victoria Infirmary. So there is, to my mind, absolutely

Victoria Infirmary. So there is, to my mind, absolutely

no role for the police to be there. I don't recognise

the name DCI Hardie and I certainly, had I been asked

But I was certainly never asked, and I have to say I am

surprised that they were there. Very surprised.

about it, would have said the police shouldn't be there.

Q. The police of course had retained responsibility for investigating, as you put it, the boxing match and what had happened earlier in the evening up to the point of the 999 calls and the events at Hayfield Road. Does that change anything? Would you consider that their on going responsibility for that aspect of the investigation would have created a legitimate need to be in attendance at the autopsy?

1	A.	No, because any samples that were obtained, say, for
2		toxicology would be obtained as part of the post mortem
3		process to ascertain what part, if any, they played in
4		his death. That information, were it relevant to what
5		had happened earlier on, could readily be conveyed to
6		PIRC and would be conveyed to PIRC would be made
7		known to PIRC, rather, after analysis. So I don't see
8		any purpose in them being there. As I say, I am very
9		surprised.
10	Q.	We heard evidence from Mr Little. Again, I am reading
11		from his transcript. He was asked whether he had
12		expressed surprise or challenged the presence of the
13		police at the post mortem and he said:
14		"Answer: I certainly never challenged it. I never
15		asked Mr Ablett why the police were there."
16		He also said:
17		"Answer: On reflection, sitting here now all these
18		years later, not only was it untidy, it threw doubt on
19		the independence aspect of the investigation into the
20		death."
21		Would you agree with that?
22	Α.	I totally agree with that, and I would say about
23		Billy Little, again, he is a former police officer whom
24		I had worked on quite a number of cases with. In fact,
25		he was a DI in Stewart Street in Glasgow when I was the

1		Fiscal for central and west Glasgow, so I had quite
2		a number of murder cases and things involving him. I am
3		absolutely, frankly, astonished that he let them be
4		there. I would have expected him to say: you have no
5		role here, please leave.
6	Q.	Kate Frame was asked about this in her evidence. She
7		didn't have any knowledge, or she gave evidence she had
8		no knowledge of the officers being present at the
9		post mortem. She was asked:
10		"Question: If you had known, would you have been
11		concerned?"
12		And she said:
13		"Answer: Yes, I would have thought it inappropriate
14		for the officers to be present."
15		And I see you are nodding your agreement. She went
16		on to say when asked what her PIRC officers might have
17		done:
18		"Answer: I think they could have raised concerns but
19		my understanding is that post mortems are convened at
20		the hand of the Crown and anyone present is there under
21		the direction of Crown Office."
22		You said a few moments ago in your evidence it was
23		for the PIRC to decide who was there?
24	Α.	I expected PIRC would staff the post mortem suite for
25		the purposes that we needed them. I had no expectation

1 the police officers would be there at all, other than, 2 as I say, for the limited purpose of identifying him and 3 then departing, and potentially to be asked to convey 4 samples to the lab at the end of the post mortem. I am 5 concerned and, had I been asked about this or known about this, I would have said that they should leave. 6 7 I say that because that is to preserve the sanctity of the investigation. Potentially, as I have indicated 8 9 earlier, we might have had police officers who were 10 going to become accused in this matter. We might have had in fact some form of case against Police Scotland. 11 12 So I can only say I am astonished and I am very 13 surprised that it wasn't challenged. Q. So this is an autopsy that has been instructed on the 14 15 authority -- or the instruction of the Crown. The PIRC 16 are investigating again on the direction of the Crown. 17 We have the Commissioner give evidence that it was a matter for the Crown to decide who was present but 18 I understand that your evidence is that really it was 19 20 a matter for the PIRC to decide who should be present. 21 I am just wondering how we might resolve this 22 difference. The post mortem is a Crown-instructed post mortem but 23 Α. the investigation had been handed by me to PIRC. 24 25 I can't see how it would be thought to be a decision of

- 1 the Fiscal who should be present at the post mortem. As
- I say, my expectation was that it would be entirely
- 3 manned by PIRC and run by them, and I am ... I am just
- 4 astonished that police officers were present.
- 5 Q. So although the post mortem had been instructed by the
- 6 Crown, do I understand your evidence correctly to be
- 7 that, because the investigation had been effectively
- 8 handed over PIRC, the post mortem is a part of that
- 9 investigation?
- 10 A. Absolutely.
- 11 Q. And it was up to them to determine who should be
- 12 present?
- 13 A. Or, if they were concerned, to seek advice and guidance
- 14 from COPFS. I can say without fear or favour, if
- someone had asked me, I would have said: tell them to
- leave.
- Q. Mr Ablett of course was present at the post mortem and
- doesn't appear to have asked anyone to leave and, from
- 19 reading his statement, there is no sense that he was
- 20 concerned by the presence of police officers. Does that
- concern or surprise you?
- 22 A. Well, it really is the same answer I have already given,
- 23 which is I don't think the police had a role there and,
- had I been aware of it, I would have asked them to
- 25 leave. I would have made sure they left, and the reason

- for that is to protect the sanctity of the investigation
 as potentially Police Scotland were accused here.
- Q. I am wondering whether Mr Ablett, who effectively
 attended the autopsy at your request on your behalf,
 whether you would have expected the same of him; that if
 he had realised that police officers were there, might
 you have expected him to challenge that? To ask them to
 leave? Or perhaps even to give you a call if he was
 unsure?
- 10 A. Well, indeed, yes. Both of those things.

11 Q. Thank you. Can I move on briefly to another matter and
12 it concerns organ retention. I wonder if we can look at
13 Mr Ablett's statement. It is SBPI 00370. Can we look
14 at paragraph 56, please. He was referred to
15 Dr Bouhaidar's statement. That was the second
16 pathologist:

"Dr Bouhaidar states the Fiscal would inform the family that the brain had been retained. I have been asked whether I advised the family of the details of the post mortem examination. I did not attempt to make contact with the family immediately after the post mortem to advise them of the post mortem or to provide them with information about organ retention.

I had not tasked with the duties of family liaison. At that stage the FLOs deployed by PIRC were responsible

1 for keeping the family updated. Their first task would be to speak with the family and develop a communication 2 3 strategy, agreeing what information the family would 4 want to be told, how much detail they would want to hear 5 e.g. did they want to hear the details of the post mortem examination, would the family expect regular 6 7 updates or would they wish to be contacted only when there was something significant to tell them, which 8 9 family member would be the primary point of contact. The effect of losing a loved one can be devastating for 10 a family. Hearing details about the post mortem 11 12 examination could be extremely upsetting. The retention 13 of the brain would very likely cause further distress, 14 even in circumstances where it was necessary to retain 15 the brain for examination. The FLOs would require to deal with the issue of communicating details of the 16 17 post mortem examination and organ retention sensitively and communication with the family could only be in 18 accordance with the family's wishes." 19 20 Can you help me to understand that where an organ 21 has been retained following an autopsy, given that the 22 examination is directed by the Crown, whose responsibility is it to tell the family the organ has 23 been retained? 24 25 A. It very much depends on the nature of the examination.

1 So in a cause of death coronial type post mortem that information would be communicated directly by SFIU 2 3 staff, who would advise the family of the retention and 4 the purpose in retaining. That said, very, very rarely 5 would there be FLOs involved in those cases. We would also utilise our VIA staff to communicate that kind of 6 7 information and give the family explanations. It has to be said that very few organs are retained for any length 8 9 of time and we don't classify a retention as, say, 10 for example, removing the brain and having it examined on the day following or a couple of days following 11 12 before it is placed back with the body and the body is 13 released. We talk about retention where we take 14 an organ or a part of an organ and we keep that for 15 a longer period of time for particular investigations to be done. So, for example, it is not infrequent in 16 17 paediatric cases that there might be cardiac issue and it requires specialist paediatric cardiac examination. 18 19 That takes months. So we will tell the family that we 20 have retained the heart and, generally speaking, in 21 those circumstances of course parents are quite happy 22 with that because they want to know what has happened and are worried about other children or future children. 23 We don't routinely, as I say, speak about retention in 24 something that is separated from the body for a short 25

period of time before being replaced with the body and
the body released.

So I wouldn't describe this as a retention, insofar as my understanding is that the neuropathology was carried out the next day and the brain reunited with the cadaver and then Mr Bayoh's body was ready to be released so far as I was concerned.

In homicide-type cases the pathologist, as they would in every case, will let SFIU know, but the Procurator Fiscal who is present at the post mortem would be aware of the retention. And while I wouldn't anticipate that individual Procurator Fiscal telling the family, I would anticipate that SFIU staff would tell the family. Because all issues surrounding retention, release of a body, retention of organs, et cetera are routed through SFIU to ensure there is one route that the pathologists know is the correct route, because historically we have had difficulties where homicide directed that a body be released when it wasn't in fact ready to be released and there was a problem because organs were not matched up. So there was one course and one way of dealing with these things.

In this situation we have a post mortem taking place on the Monday. The information would potentially only get to SFIU on the Tuesday, but they wouldn't even need

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

25

to do anything with it because by that stage the brain
would have been returned. And I would anticipate that
SFIU East being told that the brain had been removed for
the purposes of examination would make enquiry as to
whether that had happened and whether the brain was now
reunited with the body, because they would be looking to
try and arrange release.

So I am not surprised that Mr Ablett didn't do anything with it. The process would be that it would go through SFIU. But, as I say, in this instance events would have overtaken the need to do anything because the brain would have been returned.

- Q. And you say that you anticipated the brain being returned on the 5th?
- 15 Α. My last involvement in this was to seek to -- or to speak to Dr Shearer about the neuropathology. She 16 17 advised me it had been done early that morning, I think somewhere about 6 o'clock that morning, by 18 Dr Colin Smith. Now, Professor Smith he was going 19 20 abroad to some medical meeting or another and he had 21 come in early and carried out the neuropath examination, 22 so my expectation was that the mortuary technicians 23 would have reunited the brain with the body at that time. That is normal practice. 24
 - Q. There is evidence before the Inquiry. We don't need to

```
go to this form, but the reference is WIT 00052. It is
 1
 2
             an organ retention form and it tends to suggest that the
 3
             brain wasn't reunited with the body until 8 May.
 4
         Α.
             I have to say that surprises me, but I don't know
 5
             whether the brain was taken from the Lawnmarket where
             Edinburgh City Mortuary is and taken to Edinburgh Royal
 6
 7
             Infirmary where Dr Smith is generally based, dealt with
             by him on the 5th and then took some time to process
 8
 9
             back. The organ retention form is simply a way of
10
             ensuring that the Fiscal is aware that an organ has been
             taken out of the body so that the Fiscal can be assured
11
12
             at the time the body is returned that either (a) the
             organs have been replaced or (b) the family have been
13
14
             made aware that there is a retention and those matters
15
             have been discussed with them.
         MS THOMSON: We may look at that form after lunch, but I am
16
             mindful that it is shortly after 1 o'clock. I wonder if
17
             this is a convenient moment.
18
19
         LORD BRACADALE: We will stop for lunch and sit at
20
             2 o'clock.
21
         (1.02 pm)
22
                            (The short adjournment)
23
         (2.00 pm)
         LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson.
24
         MS THOMSON: Thank you, sir. Just before lunch I said that
25
```

- 1 when we came back after lunch we would look at the organ
- 2 retention form. I wondered if we could put that on
- 3 screen, it's WIT 00052.
- 4 Mr Green, this is a pro forma. Is this familiar to
- 5 you as a pro forma?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Can you help me to understand what this form is for?
- 8 A. Having had a number of instances historically where
- 9 organs were removed from cadavers and not replaced, some
- going missing in mortuaries, some being retained by
- doctors that were not known about, when I started in
- 12 SFIU I began a spreadsheet to ensure that we were aware
- of the retention of organs, whether temporary or
- long-term, so that we knew exactly what had been taken,
- where it was, when it went back, and we could assure the
- 16 Lord Advocate that these historic issues were not going
- to be repeated.
- 18 Q. Was this a form that you created?
- 19 A. I think it was probably created by an admin person, to
- 20 be perfectly honest but~...
- 21 Q. But it's to fulfil that need that you --
- 22 A. At my direction.
- 23 Q. At your direction. This particular form has been
- 24 completed and we can see that it relates to Sheku Bayoh.
- 25 The more significant information I think is on the

1 second page but before we move to that, can I just pause 2 to note that in the left-hand margin we see recorded 3 post mortem type, two doctor; date of post mortem, 4 4/5/15; identification required, yes; Fiscal to attend, 5 yes; police to attend, yes. We discussed that before 6 lunch. 7 Can you help us to understand who would, in all likelihood, have completed this form and at what stage 8 it would have been completed? 9 10 Α. It would be completed by a member of SFIU East, 11 interestingly enough there is no column there or no 12 place there to put "PIRC to attend". I wonder if it has 13 just been filled in on the basis that an investigating 14 authority would attend, potentially the admin member of 15 staff would have no knowledge whatever of PIRC's role or PIRC's involvement in this death, and indeed may have 16 had no knowledge of PIRC, to be quite frank. It is 17 18 certainly not a direction that was given at all. 19 So the form perhaps simply hasn't been updated since the Q. 20 PIRC came into being? 21 Α. Yes, and that is definitely an error. But I have to say I had never noticed that before. 22 Q. If we can scroll down to the second page of the 23 24 information, please. So here we are, it's headed up: 25 "To: Procurator Fiscal.

"East Federation Fatalities Investigation Team." 1 And if we scroll a little further up we see that the 2 3 issuing authority is Forensic Pathology at Nine Edinburgh Bioquarter, Little France and we see also in 4 5 the top left-hand corner that this relates to the death of Sheku Bayoh. If we come back to where we were, 6 7 "Organ retention": "I hereby confirm that with your prior consent in 8 9 connection with establishing the cause of death on the 10 above named deceased, I have retained the following organ: Brain." 11 12 So the "I" there is the pathologist who has carried out the removal of the organ, and the "you" who has 13 14 given prior consent must be the Fiscal? 15 Α. Yes. In this case would that be Mr Ablett, who was present at 16 Q. the autopsy? 17 18 Α. Yes. Because he was present at the time. In 19 single-doctor cases it would probably go in my name on 20 an admin basis but because the Fiscal was present during 21 the examination, his name appears. "Organ removed by", and the signature is redacted. The 22 Q. printed name I think says KA Shearer, although it is 23 24 difficult to read. The date is 4/5 2015? I recognise the signature as Kerryanne Shearer's. 25 Α.

1	Q.	"Acknowledgement of receipt of form by Fiscal
2		Bernard Ablett."
3		On 4/5. And timed at 6.16 pm:
4		"Organ examined by Colin Smith"
5		On 6/5:
6		"Organ returned to body~"
7		I can't read who returned the organ to the body but
8		that appears to have happened on 8 May and the
9		acknowledgement by the Fiscal has been signed off on
10		14 May and we see at the very bottom:
11		"Pathological examination concluded~"
12		And again Kerryanne Shearer has signed the form and
13		dated it 8 May 2015.
14		So it would appear that the brain was taken from
15		Mr Bayoh's body at the time of the autopsy on 4 May, and
16		retained until 8 May.
17		Now, before lunch you said that whether or not it
18		would be classified as a retention may be a question of
19		time or degree, and I paraphrase, those were not your
20		precise words. But I wonder if you can help us to
21		understand at what point the taking of an organ on
22		a temporary basis for the purpose of further tests or
23		examinations with a view to returning it to the body
24		crystallises into an actual retention?
2.5	A	As I think I indicated earlier, to my way of thinking

1 and indeed how we discussed it in SFIU, was that this 2 was a temporary retention. The organ was clearly 3 removed and retained for a short period of time with the 4 intention that it would be returned to the body before 5 the body was released. A proper retention is the removal of an organ for a longer purpose, and I think 6 7 I indicated that paediatric hearts are often sent -they go down to England. It is probably not worth going 8 9 further into that, but they are away for a lengthy 10 period of time. Nonetheless it is essential that COPFS retain oversight and control of what organs have been 11 12 removed, even if the intention is that that organ is 13 replaced and reunited with the body before the body is 14 released. We have to be absolutely sure that we know 15 what has gone, where it has gone, who has it, et cetera, et cetera. 16 17 So while this is a retention, it is strictly 18 a retention for a very short period of time. I note that the post mortem concluded well after office hours, 19 20 I know that Colin Smith did it again on the 6th, 21 I imagine what has happened is that this organ has gone 22 to Little France to the hospital there, been examined and then gone through a return process. I am slightly 23 surprised that it has taken so long but ... I can't 24 25 explain that. Not with any knowledge of that at all.

- 1 Clearly we have been in a position from 8 May, once the
 2 brain was reunited with the body, to release the body at
 3 that time.
 - Q. So should we understand then that a temporary retention of an organ is in circumstances where the tests or examination are performed or carried out and the organ is returned to the body before the point that the body is released?
 - A. Absolutely. Some pathology takes a lot longer, so for example historically brains used to have to be placed in formalin and allowed to fix before they could be cut. Modern practice is to cut them more or less immediately, and so they can be returned very quickly, so you don't tend to retain those organs for any period of time. You don't tend to retain the bodies for any particularly lengthy time.

But when you come to things like occular pathology, cardiac pathology, different criteria apply and as

I have indicated not infrequently those organs have to be sent elsewhere for specialist examination.

So we would call this a temporary retention and it is really there just simply for the purposes of audit and to ensure that we are aware of this because there was no expectation or intention and it wouldn't have happened that the body would be released until the brain

1 had been returned.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. I think it goes without saying that where an organ has been retained on a longer term basis there is a need to advise the family. What is the Crown Office position in relation to a temporary retention over a period of something in the order of four or five days? Is it deemed appropriate to share that information with the family, or not?
- We would certainly share that information with the 9 Α. 10 family in SFIU, in the coronial type of investigations and we would expect that that information would be 11 12 shared by the FLOs in any suspicious or homicidal death. 13 We would try to get some sense of the time that would be 14 likely to be taken for the examination. Dr Smith has 15 the -- Professor Smith rather has the contract for all 16 neuropathology in Scotland other than in the Dundee 17 area, so much would depend on the pressure of work for him and his own availability, but we would try to find 18 19 out from him how quickly the examination would be done, 20 and when it might be expected that the brain would be 21 returned, in order that that information could be passed 22 to the family. In coronial cases that information would be passed by SFIU staff, and in suspicious cases by 23 24 FLOs.
 - Q. When you refer to coronial cases, are you talking

1 about --2 I am meaning non-suspicious cases, SFIU cause of death Α. 3 type cases. 4 Q. Would that include a death in custody? 5 No, absolutely not. Α. So A death in custody would fall under which banner? 6 Q. 7 A death in custody is a mandatory FAI, therefore it's Α. a two-doctor case, therefore it falls within that group 8 9 of cases one would describe as suspicious, homicidal, 10 going to court one way or another. So it is a totally different process really to that which you find in the 11 12 ordinary cause of death-type investigation. 13 So turning to the particular circumstances that are of Q. 14 interest to the Inquiry here and the death of Mr Bayoh, 15 even though there wasn't a suggestion or an allegation of homicide, when you refer by way of shorthand to 16 17 coronial cases and homicidal cases, his case would fall under the homicidal banner rather than the coronial 18 19 banner? Yes, it's a two-doctor post mortem with full forensics, 20 Α. 21 toxicology, anything that might be required depending on 22 the circumstances as we understood them, and sits very firmly in that category. 23 You said a moment ago that in homicidal cases your 24 Q.

expectation is that the news that the organ had been

1 retained would be shared with the family by the FLOs?

Yes, because the Fiscal doesn't have direct contact with 2 Α. 3 the family at this point, there hasn't been a FLO/VIA 4 handover, the matter is not sitting really with the 5 Fiscal from that perspective and the expectation is that that FLOs will have been deployed, will have got to know 6 7 the family to some extent, will have a point of contact with the family where they can advise, just as they 8 9 would have advised about the post mortem, date of 10 post mortem, place of post mortem et cetera, they would also advise about the temporary retention of a brain and 11 12 give some indication of how quickly that retention would 13 come to an end and the body would be likely to be 14 released.

- Q. We have heard evidence that a number of representatives of the PIRC were present at the autopsy, including Mr Little.
- 18 A. Yes.

15

16

- Q. Would it surprise you to hear that the appointed FLO,

 Alistair Lewis, was unaware until the day that he gave

 his evidence before this Inquiry that the brain had been

 retained at all?
- A. Well, yes it would surprise me because, as I think

 I said earlier, Mr Little was a former DI in central

 Glasgow, he had a lot of experience of homicide cases

1		there, he had been a PIRC investigator for a significant
2		period of time. I would have thought that that was
3		an essential matter that his FLO should be made aware
4		of.
5	Q.	I want to move on another matter. It's a matter that
6		you are probably unaware of but I would like to share
7		with you some evidence that the Inquiry has heard and
8		simply seek your comment. It's to do with the
9		disclosure of the post mortem results to the officers
10		who were involved in the restraint of Mr Bayoh. So this
11		was Mr Little giving his evidence last month. He said:
12		"Answer: I made the decision to disclose that
13		information"
14		The post mortem results:
15		" to them"
16		That is the officers concerned:
17		" I have to say it is something I have never done
18		previously, I hadn't done prior to that in anything
19		I had been involved in and I haven't done it since, so
20		it wasn't decision I made lightly. But I thought and
21		hoped that it would actually break this deadlock of the
22		officers not providing statements and that was my
23		rationale for doing it."
24		We have heard evidence Mr Green, you may or may
25		not be aware but we have heard evidence that the

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

officers who attended Hayfield Road and participated in the restraint of Mr Bayoh didn't give initial accounts, didn't provide operational statements, they eventually gave statements to the PIRC on 4 June a month later. So Mr Little explained that to try to break this deadlock he shared the information with the officers, and I think what he was keen to convey to the officers was that there had not been any finding that blunt-force trauma had caused the death at autopsy. He went on to say: "Answer: I had been -- my recollection is that I had been contemplating this as a means of breaking the deadlock because at that time my opinion was that this deadlock with the police officers was causing untold harm, not only to the investigation but I envisaged that when I sat down with the family and we hadn't the statements, the untold damage it would do. I can understand the family upset and the concern and also from a point of view it was really, really hard to take this investigation forward." So that was his evidence as to a decision that he took and his rationale for taking the decision. We also heard from Mr McSporran. Now, Mr Little had been appointed as the SIO on 4 May, Mr Harrower had been the duty SIO on the 3rd, Mr Little was appointed on the 4th

and then on the 5th Mr McSporran was appointed above him

1 and Mr Little effectively became the deputy. So he was asked about this too and he said: 2 3 "Answer: I understand his rationale, he was trying 4 to break the logjam. This is the only occasion when it 5 has occurred because usually we will not pass that information without the Crown's approval." 6 7 Again, Kate Frame was asked for her comment on this when she gave evidence earlier this week and she said: 8 9 "Question: Is this something that would have caused 10 you concern, about sharing or disclosing this information about the post mortem prior to obtaining 11 12 statements from the officers?" 13 And she said yes, that would have caused her 14 concern. I am wondering with your 40 years of 15 experience as a Fiscal whether you have a view as to whether this was a decision that should have been taken 16 without the authority of the Crown? 17 A. Yes, I do have a view, and I would say this at the 18 outset: I was unaware of this and I am absolutely 19 20 astonished. In homicide cases we never disclose the 21 post mortem report to family and we do -- we maintain 22 that position right through until the case is concluded, until the trial is over. They may hear about it if they 23 are in court for that evidence and if they are going to 24 be in court to hear that evidence we will give them 25

1 broadly an outline of what will be said, but we don't do it before that and that is to maintain the sanctity of 2 3 the investigation. I've never heard of post mortem results being given 4 5 to persons who might be potentially accused in and a case like this. It's -- I really -- as I said, I am 6 7 astonished. That said, given what you have been saying about him 8 9 trying to get officers to give statements, and I was 10 aware of that from some media comment way back, I can understand why he would do that. But frankly if he had 11 12 asked me for authority to do it -- and of course I had 13 nothing to do with the case at that stage -- I would 14 definitely have referred it to Crown counsel for 15 Crown counsel's decision. It is not a decision I would have taken myself. I am amazed if it wasn't referred to 16 the Crown. Yes, it rather beggars belief, to be honest. 17 Can I move on to another issue, and it's the final issue 18 Q. I wish to discuss with you today, what we might call 19 20 cultural considerations. If we could perhaps pull up 21 again your first statement, page 8, paragraph 21: 22 "I was advised Mr Bayoh was black at the outset. I immediately apprehended that whatever the facts and 23 circumstances yet to be established that this was very 24 likely to be a very high-profile matter and that 25

questions of race would inevitably arise. The fact that 1 2 the deceased was black made no difference to the 3 decisions and actions that I took." 4 I wanted to ask you some questions around this. Why is it that you say that you consider that questions of 5 race would inevitably arise? 6 7 Well, as I answered earlier in respect of another Α. question, I was involved in deaths investigation really 8 9 for half my service, and in charge of it for very 10 lengthy periods of that, and I was aware of issues that had occurred in England, where there had been tremendous 11 12 media interest, and indeed speculation, where 13 individuals who were black had died in police stations 14 and that sort of thing. I was aware that there had been 15 a number of such issues in America, and that they had been very, very high profile with lots of interested 16 17 parties making comment and speculating in a lot of 18 cases. It seemed to me that was very likely to happen in 19 20 this case. We had not had a circumstance in Scotland 21 where an individual who was black had died while in 22 custody, and I fully anticipated that the media would be very, very interested in this. I fully anticipated that 23 politicians would be very interested in this. Indeed, 24 I thought it was going to become exceptionally high 25

- 1 profile for those reasons.
- Q. Did you anticipate that Mr Bayoh's race or the
 possibility of a racial motivation would form part of

the PIRC's investigation?

- 5 A. You simply cannot discount that. Race is always
- an issue from two perspectives and the first of these is
- 7 that one wants to be as sensitive as one can to the
- 8 religious and racial elements and the funerary rites and
- 9 wishes of nearest relatives, but at the same time you
- 10 also have to consider immediately whether race is
- a motivation for what has occurred, and I had certainly
- had one case that I recall in Glasgow where an asylum
- seeker was attacked and murdered and that was racially
- 14 motivated.

- Q. You say you have to consider immediately whether race
- 16 was motivation for what occurred. I am wondering
- 17 whether, when you gave the initial instruction PIRC to
- investigate this death in custody, you expressly tasked
- them with looking at whether there was a racial
- 20 motivation to the officers' behaviour or whether race
- 21 was otherwise relevant to their investigation?
- 22 A. I certainly didn't task them in that way because at the
- time I issued the instruction there was nothing to
- 24 indicate to me that a crime had been committed.
- Therefore, there was no indication, no suspicion, and

1 as I have already said, I think, it was possible that Mr Bayoh had died of a natural cause that was 2 unconnected to or perhaps only very peripherally 3 4 connected to his interaction with the police officers. 5 So there was nothing that caused me to highlight that. It was certainly in my mind, and I would be 6 7 exceptionally surprised if the PIRC investigators weren't thinking the same way. 8 Q. You said the fact that Mr Bayoh was black made no 9 10 difference to your decisions or actions. I am wondering whether the fact that he was Muslim affected your 11 12 decisions and actions at all, with particular reference 13 to the arrangements around the post mortem? Well, they did insofar as I have already indicated. My 14 Α. 15 previous experience showed that those of the Muslim 16 faith were not happy to have nearest relatives 17 post mortemed but would -- were more tolerant, shall we 18 say, of us requiring to carry out post mortems than, 19 for example, those of the Jewish faith who tended to be 20 even more concerned, and very, very, very much trying to 21 avoid a post mortem taking place. 22 So my experience was that those of the Muslim faith would be understanding of this but they would wish to 23 have the remains returned at the earliest point. So my 24 25 intention, and as I indicated earlier my hope was that

1		while I absolutely had to do a post mortem, while we
2		absolutely had to investigate this, time and speed were
3		of the essence, and my expectation was that we would
4		carry out these investigations as quickly as possible
5		and return Mr Bayoh's body to his nearest relatives as
6		quickly as we possibly could.
7	Q.	Thank you. I wonder if we can look briefly at the Crown
8		Office guidance on cultural and religious awareness.
9		This is COPFS 05922. While that is being brought up on
10		screen here it is. We will see it is headed up:
11		"COPFS cultural and religious awareness guidance on
12		death customs and traditions."
13		And the Crown Office have advised this was in force
14		with effect from 14 November 2013 and was in force at
15		the time of Mr Bayoh's death. If we scroll through, we
16		will see that there is guidance in relation to various
17		different religions and if we get as far as Islam.
18		Thank you. And scroll a little further down, please.
19		Stop there the paragraph above the heading "Judaism":
20		"Rules concerning separation of the sexes apply to
21		the corpse therefore the same gender as the deceased
22		should be used to deal with the body."
23		I wonder if that was a requirement of the Muslim
24		faith that you were familiar with?
25	Α.	It is many years since I saw this, I have to say, and

25

1 I can't say that I had it in mind at the time the 2 post mortem arrangements were made. But as I have 3 indicated earlier on, there are only a very limited 4 number of forensic pathologists, and only an even 5 less -- a greater limited number who are actually available to carry out examinations at particular times. 6 7 If one looks at the numbers of forensic pathologists in Glasgow, I think I might be right in saying there are no 8 9 men employed in that capacity there. So, you know, one 10 is limited by the -- by that factor if nothing else, and it certainly wasn't something that I had in mind or had 11 12 regard to. It might be a limiting factor, there might simply not 13 Q. 14 have been a male pathologist --15 Α. Indeed. -- available, but I think you have quite candidly said 16 Q. it wasn't something that was in your mind, so can 17 we take it that you didn't yourself make enquiry as to 18 19 whether it might have been possible for both doctors 20 performed the autopsy to be male? 21 Α. No, it didn't and I can say this: that particularly in 22 the West of Scotland, where the vast majority of the deaths cases arise -- so 50% of all the deaths in 23 Scotland occur within the area served by Glasgow 24

University -- the pathologist there would carry out very

- 1 large numbers of examinations, and the female staff there would undertake these cases routinely in SFIU 2 3 cases, it was never something that was brought to my 4 attention. It was never the subject of a complaint to 5 SFIU. And while I have no doubt that I read this some considerable time ago, it certainly wasn't something to 6 7 the front of my mind because everyday practice was such that if you died in the west of Scotland and you 8 9 required to be post mortemed to get an MCCD there was 10 every chance it would be a female pathologist who would carry out that investigation. 11
- 12 Q. This of course was a double-doctor autopsy?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- We have heard evidence, I think, that the division of 14 Q. 15 responsibility was such that one was taking the lead and performing the examination whilst the other had more of 16 a background role and was note-taking? 17
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 And the second doctor was a male. Did you give any Q. 20 thought to perhaps requesting that the male doctor, 21 Dr Bouhaidar, lead given that the lead pathologist is 22 the one who performs the examination, and that Dr Shearer perhaps perform the secondary role? 23
- As I indicated, it wasn't to the front of my mind so 24 Α. 25 I didn't give consideration to that at all. It is

- certainly something that had it been to the front of my
 mind it would have been very easy to phone Ralph and
 Kerryanne and discuss with them, and I don't doubt they
 would have been happy to swap places.
 - Q. Can I take you back to something you said in your evidence before lunch, and it was when I was asking you questions about your state of knowledge in terms of the family's position on identification. You mentioned elders and I wanted to just ask you some questions about elders.
- 11 A. Yes.

Q. Again, I have the [draft] transcript in front of me so

I will read back to you what you said and then ask you

some questions:

"Answer: My understanding at the time was they were not willing to attend at that point and identify, that they were waiting for elders -- and I remember the word being used, and it struck me as an unusual word and I didn't quite understand what it meant. But it was of no moment, they were certainly waiting for others to come to Kirkcaldy."

I just wanted to ask you some questions around the use of the world "elders". What did you think it meant?

A. I assumed that it probably meant older members of the family and potentially religious elders. Like I say, it

25

1 was of no moment to me but I had never heard that word 2 used in that context before, which is why I recalled it 3 particularly. Like I say, it really wasn't of any 4 moment at all because the whole issue was that, as 5 I understood it, they were not going to attend, they 6 were waiting for this to happen, there was no certainty 7 about when it might happen, that there would be discussion but there was no certainty that they would 8 come to the mortuary thereafter. 9 10 So to be honest I simply noted it because I thought 11 it was an unusual word in the circumstances. Normally 12 one would have -- you would be told the mother or father 13 are not willing to come and identify, you know, the 14 brothers and sisters are not willing to come. But those 15 words were not used, it was the word "elders". You say that it might have been religious elders or 16 Q. could have been senior or older members of the family? 17 18 Yes, indeed, indeed. Α. 19 In either scenario what were the implications of that so Q. 20 far as you were concerned; were there any? 21 Α. There were no implications in that at all. 22 Did it say anything, did it speak to you at all of the Q. culture within the family? 23 On mature reflection it suggests to me that they were 24 Α.

probably very religious and these would be religious

Τ	elders, but I can't say that I thought about that at the
2	time.
3	Q. Did it occur to you at the time to ask Mr Harrower for
4	clarification as to who these people were?
5	A. I don't think he knew. He simply said: they are waiting
6	for people to come, they are waiting for elders.
7	I didn't ask him and he didn't volunteer any other
8	information if he was aware of it.
9	MS THOMSON: Thank you Mr Green. Can you bear with me for
10	just a moment please. I have no further questions, sir.
11	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. Are there any Rule 9
12	applications? Ms Mitchell.
13	Mr Green, would you withdraw to the witness room
14	while I hear an application.
15	(The witness withdrew)
16	Ms Mitchell.
17	Rule 9 application by MS MITCHELL
18	MS MITCHELL: There are two issues I would like to ask the
19	witness about in respect of this Rule 9. The first is
20	to clarify exactly what his understanding was in
21	relation to whether or not the family wished to attend
22	and were waiting for someone. The reason I say that is
23	because at various points in his evidence it appears
24	that he has been clear that there was no indication that
25	the family wished to see Mr Bayoh. I first make

1	reference in [draft] line 72/17 of the witness's
2	evidence, where he says:
3	"Answer: I was given no timeframe for her attending,
4	and in particular I was never told that she would wish
5	to view the body. I recollection is clear~"
6	That is literally what it [draft] says.
7	" that they were unwilling to attend at that
8	time, that they were waiting for the arrival of others
9	and there would then be some discussion and there was no
LO	indication given to me that the family wished to go to
11	see the to see Mr Bayoh, nor that they would be
12	willing to do so or to carry out an identification."
13	Similarly at [draft] line 56/18 he said:
L 4	"Answer: My understanding at the time was they were
L5	not willing to go attend at that point and identify,
16	that they were waiting for elders~"
L7	And he goes on to explain how that word struck him,
L8	and he said:
L 9	" and that there would be a discussion,
20	presumably with those individuals who had arrived and
21	those who were already present in Kirkcaldy about
22	whether or not they would attend to identify Mr Bayoh's
23	body. Thus there was total uncertainty~"
24	When the evidence of Kadi Johnson was put to him at
25	[draft] 68/22, it was put to him by my learned friend:

1 "Question: So you accept on the basis of the evidence of Kadi Johnson, which I have shared with you 2 today, that she gave a clear indication that Sheku's 3 4 mother was willing to attend and identify the body and 5 she would be arriving the following day? "Answer: Yes." 6 7 "Question: So there was no ambiguity as to her position and no uncertainty about the time frame; would 8 9 that be fair? 10 "Answer: Well, it's not a matter for me to assess 11 whether what she says is accurate on the basis of what 12 you are putting to me indeed that is the case. As 13 I have indicated, had that been made clear to me and had 14 I been made aware of any of that, I would have sought to 15 put this back for a day to allow his mother to attend the mortuary." 16 17 Then at the end just the end of his evidence there at [draft] 129 he said: 18 "Answer: Like I say, it really wasn't of any moment 19 20 at all because the whole issue was that I understood it 21 they were not going to attend, they were waiting for 22 this to happen, there was no certainty about when it might happen and there would be a discussion but there 23 was no certainty around that they would come to the 24 mortuary thereafter." 25

```
1
                 However, in evidence which was put to him in
 2
             relation to Kate Frame, Kate Frame says herself that she
             was aware of the family's wishes too, and I quote lines
 3
             37/9:
 4
                 "Question: And you were aware of the family's wishes
 5
             too. By that I am understanding you understood and you
 6
 7
             were aware that Mr Bayoh's family wished his mother to
             come up from London --
 8
 9
                 "Answer: I remember.
10
                 "Question: -- prior to identifying the body at
11
             post mortem?
12
                 "Answer: Yes, I think my recollection is that it was
13
             family members, I don't recall it being tied just to the
14
             mother.
15
                 "Question: Was the mother to be part of that group?
                 "Answer: Yes.
16
                 "Question: As well as others?
17
                 "Answer: Yes, I understood that to be the case."
18
                 Then later in her evidence at 38/11 she was asked:
19
20
                 "Question: Tell us about your discussions with
21
             Mr Green at Crown Office."
22
                 She says:
                 "Answer: Well, I was aware from Mr Little that
23
             Crown Office -- and I didn't know precisely who -- had
24
             been made aware of this issue, and I wanted to ensure
25
```

1 that he, as head of the -- what was the Deaths Unit before this was aware of the circumstances so that it 2 could be considered. 3 "Question: What did you tell Mr Green? 4 5 "Answer: My recollection is I told him that the family had indicated they want other family members 6 7 present before any post mortem went ahead. "Question: What was his response? 8 "Answer: I think he was trying to balance the need 9 for -- well, to see if a cause of death could be 10 ascertained against that. But the eventual outcome was 11 12 that the post mortem had been arranged by that time and 13 was to continue." 14 Now, her evidence clearly was that she had 15 an understanding of what the family's position was, that she spoke to Mr Green and her evidence was that she 16 17 tried to persuade him to delay matters. In relation to -- when it was put to him, that message, he said he 18 had no recollection of it, he said: 19 20 "Answer: No, I'm afraid it doesn't -- I have no 21 recollection of it. I have no reason to doubt the 22 conversation took place. What I would say is that again, on the information that you have given me, I am 23 not being given any additional information about when 24 this is, when the family might be available, when the 25

post mortem might take place."

So that is in fact different, because in the questions that are posed there, it presupposes that he was told that the family were interested in coming to a post mortem. Because the question he asks is:

I wasn't given more information about this, when the family might be available, when the post mortem might take place. So that would tend to suggest that in the course of that conversation he had been made aware that the family wished to attend. I would like to put that to him for his consideration.

If he does not think that and says that he does not recall it, to ask him why in the circumstances then did he think Kate Frame was asking him to delay it.

The second issue I would like to put, somewhat shorter, is my learned friend ascertained in-chief that the witness said the fact Mr Bayoh was black made no difference to his decisions or actions. I want to test that proposition in relation to his decision to press ahead with a post mortem as soon as possible.

The reason for that is that, as we have heard, he anticipated the matter being high profile, and when asked about it being high profile earlier this morning he immediately linked that with the fact that there had been a very high profile matter in America where

1 an individual who is black had died, again at the hands of white police officers. So his first thought in 2 connection with hearing from Superintendent Blackhall 3 4 that a black male died was to this particular high 5 profile case. What he was asked about in relation to the timing of 6 7 the post mortem was: "Question: You said a moment ago you made it clear 8 to Dr Shearer that this was an autopsy that had to be 9 10 conducted as quickly as possible given the circumstances. By that do you mean because it was the 11 12 death of a man, perhaps even a black man, in police 13 custody? 14 "Answer: No, it mattered not that Mr Bayoh was 15 black, that wasn't the issue at all. The issue was that we needed to know whether this man's death had been 16 17 brought about by acts of police officers." What I am wondering is -- and whether this witness 18 19 can assist us with that, was when he was carrying out 20 the balancing act is he sure that the fact that Mr Bayoh 21 was black and therefore that this would be high profile 22 was not a factor that he considered in the speed at which this post mortem took place. And therefore was 23 the fact that Mr Bayoh was black not in a sense 24 25 indirectly a factor which was important in his

1	consideration in respect of having the post mortem done
2	as soon as possible. Ie, had it not been high profile
3	because he was a black man who died in police custody,
4	might the imperative for a quick post mortem have been
5	less critical?
6	Those are my questions.
7	LORD BRACADALE: Very well. I shall allow you to explore
8	these lines of questioning. Can we have the witness
9	back, please.
10	(The witness returned to the stand)
11	Mr Green, Ms Mitchell KC, who represents the
12	families of Sheku Bayoh, has some questions for you.
13	Questions from MS MITCHELL
14	MS MITCHELL: I would like to try and clarify your
15	understanding of a matter as a result of your evidence
16	so far. Earlier today you were asked at various
17	occasions about your understanding of the position of
18	the family in the post mortem, and if you will bear with
19	me I will just run through and check that I have
20	understood your evidence correctly. The first is you
21	said:
22	"Answer: I was given no timeframe for her attending,
23	and in particular I was never told that she would wish
24	to view the body. My recollection is clear that they
25	were unwilling to attend at that the time, that they

1 were waiting for the arrival of others, that there would then be some discussion. And there was no indication 2 given to me that the family wished to go to see 3 4 Mr Bayoh, nor that they would be willing to do so, or to carry out an identification." 5 6 You said something similar again at a later stage: 7 "Answer: My understanding at the time was that they were not willing to attend at that point and identify, 8 they were waiting for elders -- and I remember the word 9 10 being used ..." You have talked about that in detail and you have 11 12 said after those people arrived that: 13 "Answer: ... there would be a discussion, presumably with those individuals who had arrived and those who 14 15 were already present in Kirkcaldy, about whether or not they would attend to identify Mr Bayoh's body. Thus 16 there was total uncertainty~..." 17 18 Then you recall the evidence of Kadi Johnson, the 19 sister of Sheku Bayoh, was put to you about the fact that she had made her position quite clear. And, 20 21 of course, that wasn't known to you and what you said in 22 that regard, you accepted if that had been said, then there was no ambiguity. And you said: 23 "Answer: Well, it is not a matter for me to assess 24 25 whether what she says is accurate but on the basis of

1 what you are putting to me, indeed that is the case. I have indicated that, had it been made clear to me 2 in -- had I been made aware of any of that, I would have 3 4 sought to put this back a day to allow his mother to 5 attend the mortuary." And that is the evidence earlier today. 6 7 What I want to check with you is Kate Frame says that she was aware of the family's wishes, and by that 8 I mean that she was aware that Mr Bayoh's family wished 9 10 his mother to come up from London prior to identifying the body at the post mortem. That is her understanding 11 12 of what the position was. She said -- in fairness, she 13 said her recollection was family members. She didn't recall it being tied to just the mother coming but she 14 15 understood the mother would be part of that group. Then she was asked: 16 17 "Question: Tell us about your discussion with Mr Green at Crown Office." 18 19 And she said: 20 "Answer: Well, I was aware from Mr Little at 21 Crown Office, and I didn't know precisely who, had been 22 made aware of this issue and I wanted to ensure that he, as head of the $\--$ what was the deaths unit before this 23 was aware of the circumstances so that that could be 24 considered." 25

1	Then it is said:
2	"Question: What did you tell Mr Green?
3	"Answer: My recollection is that I told him the
4	family had indicated they wanted the other family
5	members present before the post mortem went ahead."
6	And it is said:
7	"Question: What was his response?"
8	And you talked about balancing it out. Now, you
9	obviously don't recall having that conversation. You
10	have already given evidence in that regard. But in your
11	response you said the following:
12	"Answer: No, I'm afraid it doesn't. I have no
13	recollection of it. I have no reason to doubt that the
14	conversation took place. What I would say is that again
15	on the information that you have given me, I am not
16	being given any additional information about when
17	this when the family might be available, when the
18	post mortem might take place. I think it is entirely
19	conceivable that I did say to Kate: no, there is no
20	certainty here, it's going ahead as arranged because how
21	long is this week going to be? How long is a piece of
22	string, in effect? I was as I have indicated
23	earlier, I was exceptionally conscious of the need to
24	find out why Mr Bayoh had died."
25	What that suggests particularly "I am not being

- given any additional information about when this -- when the family might be available, when the post mortem might take place", is that an acceptance from you that you accept that Kate Frame in fact did have this conversation with you and you are saying that it wouldn't have made any difference because the additional information about when the family was going to be there wasn't being given to you?
 - A. I have no recollection of the call, but I don't doubt that Kate recalls it and is saying what happened. I can say this and only this: I do not recall being given any additional information beyond what I was given by Keith Harrower at half past 11 at night. So there was nothing that I remember being said to me that caused me at that time to pause and reconsider the decision.
 - Q. But do you see the issue; that she is clear in her evidence that she was phoning you up to ask to delay for that particular purpose and what you are saying is you don't doubt, if she is saying that, that is correct?
 - A. I don't doubt that there was a call but I have no recollection whatever of the circumstances and I certainly can say that I recall nothing whatever that was changed because, had it been changed, I would have been reconsidering the position and I may have arrived at a different view --

1 Q. That is perhaps what I am actually putting to you. If during the course of that conversation that took place 2 3 you were saying: well, when might the family be 4 available? When might the post mortem take place? But 5 you weren't being given answers to those specific questions. So even having been told those factors, you 6 7 thought: well, I haven't got additional information, the post mortem must continue. But in fact the additional 8 information was the family did want to attend. 9 10 Α. I don't recall ever being told the family wanted to 11 attend. 12 Q. In that case, why might you pause at the question when 13 the family might be available or when the post mortem 14 might take place? 15 Α. I am sorry, I am not following that. What you said is you didn't have any recollection of it 16 Q. 17 took place but you said: "I am not being given any additional information 18 19 about this ... when the family might be available, when 20 the post mortem might take place." 21 So what you are saying is, if that conversation had 22 taken place, it wouldn't have given you additional information, and I am suggesting to you it would have 23 given you additional information. On your evidence, it 24 25 would have given you the information that the family did

23

24

25

1 want to attend. 2 Well, I can only repeat that I don't recall any Α. additional information given to me. 3 4 Q. I would like to move on, please. In your evidence you 5 said that the fact that Mr Bayoh was black made no difference to your decisions or actions. You were first 6 7 informed that a black man had died in police custody when Superintendent Blackhall called you to advise that 8 9 it had happened you said about 7.15 and that there was 10 a black male, that a knife had been involved and there were police sent to search for him, et cetera. Now, 11 12 later in your evidence you said that you anticipated the 13 matter being high profile and you have given some more 14 information about that this afternoon. When you were 15 asked about it being high profile you indicated that you were aware that there had been a very high profile 16 17 matter in America when an individual who was black had died, again at the hands of police officers. 18 19 In your evidence you also said that you made it 20 clear to Dr Shearer that this was an autopsy that had to 21 be conducted as quickly as possible, given the 22 circumstances, and you were asked:

"Question: By that do you mean because that was a death of a man, perhaps even a black man, in police custody?"

1		And what you said is:
2		"Answer: It mattered not that Mr Bayoh was black.
3		That wasn't the issue at all. The issue was that we
4		needed to know whether this man's death had been brought
5		about by the acts of police officers."
6		So what I want to ask you about that was, when you
7		were carrying out your balancing act, are you sure the
8		fact that Mr Bayoh was black and there had been high
9		profile cases and that this was going to be high profile
10		and it was important for you to know the outcome of the
11		post mortem as soon as possible, not part of your
12		process of consideration of having the post mortem as
13		soon as possible?
14	Α.	The fact that he was black did not impact on my
15		decision-making at all. The issue for me was that we
16		had an allegation that or a situation where he had
17		died while in the custody of a number of police
18		officers. We had no idea why he had died. I had been
19		made aware that there was no blood injury, there was
20		nothing obvious at the Victoria Infirmary and it seemed
21		to me that in everyone's interest we needed to know what
22		that was, and I would have taken the same view had he
23		been white. It was not relevant at all.
24	Q.	So was the fact that this was going to be a high profile
25		case because he was black one of the factors in the

you like.

4

24

- consideration of how quickly it would have to be done?

 Not directly the fact that he was black but the fact

 that this was going to be high profile. Indirectly, if
- 5 I wouldn't say so. We have a situation where, even had Α. he been white, we have a number of police officers who 6 7 have been involved in this. They are potentially going to be under suspicion but we don't know really what the 8 9 situation is with that until we have a post mortem and 10 find out what caused his death. From any perspective we needed to know that. It might have been just as high 11 12 profile potentially if it had been a well-known person 13 who was white. I was concerned that it would be high 14 profile and concerned that the law officers and others 15 would know that this had happened --
- 16 Q. That is what I am wondering --
- A. -- but it really wasn't an impact on my wanting this

 answer very quickly. As I said earlier in my evidence,

 the knowledge of what caused him to die is the

 foundation stone upon which the investigation rests.

 And really starts; it is hard to see how you investigate

 if you don't know what has actually caused the death.

 So I would have been pushing for it just the same.
 - Q. So it's the fact -- it's the fact that it's a person that has died in police custody that has caused the

1 speed, not -- it bears no relation to the fact that this 2 would be high profile. You mention there for example 3 you were aware it was going to be high profile and then 4 perhaps the law officers would take a particular 5 interest in it. There was no consideration in your mind: I need to get this done as soon as possible. This 6 7 is going to be high profile. People are going to be asking me questions and I want to say I have acted with 8 9 speed? 10 Α. No, I can say without fear or favour that in the other deaths in police custody that I have dealt with, and 11 12 I have dealt with a number of them over the years, a 13 similar approach was taken, namely, we want an answer, 14 we want an answer quickly, we need to know whether we've 15 got police officers who are responsible for this death or, you know, whether it's a drugs death or a natural 16 17 death or whatever it might be, whether that is -- you 18 know, the death has occurred in a police station or outwith a police station. There is a real need to get 19 20 that answer and to get that information as quickly as 21 possible. Mr Bayoh's colour was not relevant. 22 MS MITCHELL: I am obliged. LORD BRACADALE: Mr Green, thank you very much for coming to 23 give evidence to the Inquiry. I am very grateful for 24 25 your time. The Inquiry is about to adjourn and then you

```
1
            will be free to go.
 2
                 The Inquiry will adjourn.
 3
        (3.00 pm)
              (The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Friday,
 4
 5
                                 8 March 2024)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Τ	INDEX
2	MR DAVID GREEN (sworn)
3	Questions from MS THOMSON
4	Rule 9 application by MS MITCHELL135
5	Questions from MS MITCHELL142
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
13	
L4	
15	
L 6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	