1 Tuesday, 14 March 2023 2 (10.00 am)3 (Proceedings delayed) 4 (10.05 am)DETECTIVE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT PATRICK CAMPBELL (continued) 5 Questions from MS GRAHAME (continued) 6 7 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Mr Campbell. 8 THE WITNESS: Good morning, sir. 9 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 10 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Good morning. 11 12 A. Good morning. 13 Q. I'd like to ask you about what your views were on 3 May 14 about separating the officers when they went to the 15 canteen. Now, we've heard some evidence already from Conrad Trickett about what the post-incident procedure 16 17 SOP says. A. Yeah. 18 Q. And we've heard some comments from Colin Robson about 19 20 his views, and he talked in his Inquiry statement about 21 you pressuring him on that, and then in evidence he said you were pressure testing his views. 22 I'm interested in what your views were. 23 24 Yeah. So on 3 May when I was instructed to become SIO Α. 25 round about 08.30 hours, 08.15 hours on 3 May, initial

1 consultation with Colin Robson at that time via telephone call prior to leaving Livingston Office was 2 3 around a number of different initial priorities. One of 4 the discussions I had with Colin then, and I believe 5 when I was driving through to Kirkcaldy, was round about discussing with him the location of the officers, status 6 7 of the officers, and it was -- I had discussion with two 8 investigators, experienced investigators, and it was 9 really -- I heard Colin's evidence round about, I think 10 he indicated he felt under pressure around it. But it wasn't that. It was a consideration, and although the 11 12 SOP quite clearly states -- and the SOP obviously we 13 were utilising at that time was the PIP for armed 14 policing under the APP, so it was being flexible with 15 that SOP through the work of Conrad. So I didn't really have any great issue, if I had to 16 17 separate the officers at that time, so it was 18 a consideration. But again thereafter what I was trying to do was balance the status of the officers, the 19 20 location of the officers, where they were at that time, 21 how long they already had been together. 22 So at 08.30 hours they already had been together one hour on the instruction of Inspector Kay to move 23 from the locus back to the canteen, which Inspector Kay 24 25 did with the best of intentions. So again, there was

1 a number of points which I was kind of playing out in my head around the best way forward with this, and 2 I discussed it with Lesley Boal at that time as well. 3 4 So it was a serious consideration round about the 5 necessity to separate them: was it safe to do so, what was the condition of the officers, was it practical 6 7 based on the accommodation within Kirkcaldy Office, and was it necessary? 8 So again, the necessity aspect of it was really 9 10 important round about -- the fact was the officers at that stage and through the duration of 3 May were 11 12 witnesses, so again to separate witnesses, why were we 13 doing that? So again the other aspect of looking at: 14 were they involved or suspected of any criminality at 15 that time? No, they weren't. Were they suspected of any misconduct at that time? No, they weren't. Would 16 17 we have been able -- or would we be able to manage the officers within the canteen within what became the PIM 18 suite with putting in suitable control measures around 19 20 that? And what I mean is putting in individuals who 21 could ensure that there was non-conferral with the 22 officers involved in the incident, within the canteen 23 area. 24 So again that was all playing out, as I say,

discussions with Lesley, with Colin, around my thought

25

process around that, and the requirement to separate,
which ultimately did not materialise, because I didn't
believe there was a necessity to separate them. Their
status was that of witnesses. What -- the direction and
the decision I made was in line with the standard
operating procedure in place in 2015, and is still in
place today around that.

So again, it was that balance where the welfare and the wellbeing of the officers, but also ensuring that we could get the benefits for the investigation as well at that time. So it wasn't just a quick flippant decision I made not to separate them. There was a lot of thought went into the reason why I didn't eventually separate them.

And again, if my decision had changed through the course of my journey to Kirkcaldy Police Office, and I had decided once I arrived that I would separate them, I simply would have done that, I wouldn't have hesitated with that, if my thought -- if the rationale behind my thinking at that time had changed, I simply would have separated them. But it didn't, and, as I say, I was more than happy with the decision I made around that.

- Q. From the perspective purely of SIO --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- and from the investigation, what would the advantages

1 to you have been of separating the officers? The aspect is collaboration of the witnesses or the 2 Α. 3 potential aspect of collaboration and discussing the 4 incident prior to you getting that, that initial 5 perception of the officers in a statement form or a personal initial account of what actually had 6 7 occurred. 8 So again, there is that aspect of the fact, would there be benefit as an SIO to separate at that time, and 9 10 again you're thereafter balancing it with some of the other aspects I looked at: was it safe to do so, was it 11 12 practical, was it necessary, what would be the 13 perception of the officers if I had to separate them, 14 put them in individual rooms and put uniformed officers 15 standing by them almost to manage them; I mean, what perception would that play out round about their welfare 16 and wellbeing? 17 18 So it was that balance, could -- as SIO, what I was 19 looking to achieve through the fact that their evidence 20 or their statements would be sterile as such, could that 21 be achieved by putting in place suitable control measures within the canteen area? 22 When you use the word "sterile", what do you mean? 23 Q. I think just the best evidence, you know what I mean, 24 Α. that their evidence is not contaminated in any way, that 25

25

1 what we have is a true recollection of what actually 2 occurred and it's not in any way tainted by collaboration with other officers who were at the scene 3 4 as such. 5 In collaboration, you mean -- we have heard the word Q. "conferral" used --6 7 Α. Yes. 8 -- you used the word "tainted", so no influence on their Q. 9 recollection from the recollection of others. 10 And you talk about their perception; was that a significant factor in weighing up the different 11 12 options open to you? 13 No. No, that was solely a decision by myself, looking Α. 14 at that independently, not involved in the actual 15 incident, coming in from outwith the area to lead on the 16 investigation. So there was no pressure on me to have 17 the officers separated or have the officers remain together within the canteen. That was solely a decision 18 19 I made as SIO. And you twice used the word "safe"; what did you mean by 20 Q. 21 that? 22 So what I mean by that is that -- and it was clear when Α. 23 I addressed them that they were extremely traumatised by what had occurred, more so when they obviously were 24

aware that Mr Bayoh had passed away, was deceased. And

1 what I was aware of the time, after I addressed officers, is there was officers from 6-7 months' police 2 3 service that were actually probationers that were there 4 as well as officers of maybe 27-28 years' service. So 5 there was that whole dynamic spread of experience of officers and what they were going through at that time. 6 7 So that aspect of welfare and wellbeing was 8 paramount as well, round about the fact to put 9 an individual in a separate part of the building almost 10 with some sort of control measure in place such as an officer sitting with that individual, what would 11 12 that -- how would that impact on their welfare, 13 wellbeing, their mental health at that particular time, 14 whereby it's quite clear that the standard operating 15 procedure is not to separate and still is today. In the initial stages you've talked about the journey to 16 Q. 17 Kirkcaldy and keeping an open mind about the different 18 hypotheses. 19 Yeah. Α. Did you initially want to separate the officers? 20 Q. 21 Α. No. As I say, it was a consideration, but, as I say, 22 the number of different -- that was only one pillar of 23 the investigation that I was considering during that 45-minute journey to Kirkcaldy. 24 Q. So if Colin Robson formed that impression --25

- 1 A. Yeah.
 2 Q. -- wh
 - Q. -- what would you say about that?
- A. So to me it was simply a discussion with myself as SIO
 leading the investigation but Colin as that on-call
 detective inspector who had a better grip at that time,
- a better understanding of the environment, the landscape
- 7 that the officers were in at that stage and where they
- 8 were in the journey and what had happened at that point.
- 9 So although I was getting briefed by Colin I just wanted
- 10 to get a more in-depth understanding of exactly what we
- 11 had prior to my arrival at Kirkcaldy Office.
- 12 Q. Can I move on and ask you, you told us last week about
- going into the canteen and talking to the officers --
- 14 A. Yeah.
- 15 Q. -- and you also told us that you wanted the equipment,
- 16 the police officers' clothing and equipment, to be
- 17 recovered.
- 18 A. Yeah.
- 19 Q. I think you had mentioned that to the officers.
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 21 Q. I think you gave evidence about that last week.
- 22 Could you tell us about your discussion with
- 23 Conrad Trickett in relation to recovery of the clothing?
- A. It was very quick. As I say, I was going to brief the
- 25 officers at the time and I was just explaining to Colin

- 1 that we would be looking to, with their consent, seize their external clothing, footwear and their officer 2 3 safety equipment. However, that would be done under 4 sterile conditions. I'd already arranged for 5 DCI Stuart Houston to come over and manage the various scenes at that time, and also him being the officer 6 7 involved in the recovery of their equipment. So, as 8 I say, it was a very quick discussion with Colin what 9 I was expecting and what I was going to speak to the 10 officers around. Sorry, was that a conversation with Colin Robson? 11 Q. 12 No, Conrad, sorry. Α. 13 Conrad? Q. 14 Yes. Α. 15 Then you looked at the 11.30 Gold Group minutes last Q. week and noted that -- forensic recovery of equipment 16 17 was noted at that meeting. 18 Α. Yes. Q. Then we've heard evidence from Conrad Trickett that he'd 19 20 noted in his PIM log that around 3.30 in the afternoon 21 he'd discussed the length of time the recovery of
- 23 A. Yeah.

22

Q. -- and he'd discussed that with you. Do you remember
him raising that with you?

clothing was taking --

- A. Yeah, it was a very brief discussion again, I think it
 was in a corridor outside one of the rooms, and there
 were a number of reasons around why that was taking
 quite an extended period of time.
 - Q. Can you tell us about those?

A. Yeah. So basically Stuart Houston arrived round about midday or thereabouts and was given the task by myself delegated to him to take control of all the scenes, as people have discussed, with one of the scenes being the canteen and the officers within there and round about how we could ensure that was done under sterile conditions.

So the -- that thereafter moved on to Stuart developing the forensic strategy document which we've already discussed, and thereafter the arrival of PIRC round about half past 1 that day. Myself, Stuart, Colin and one or two others went to a briefing round about quarter to 2 with them before the Gold Group, the second Gold Group, whereby again the investigative priorities were discussed with DSI Keith Harrower from PIRC and his team. We went into the Gold Group after that and the forensic strategy document was finalised just after the second Gold Group, and we went into the forensic strategy briefing with PIRC around about 16.45 hours, and at that stage that was signed off by PIRC and by

1 myself and we agreed the priorities around that.

So it did take a bit of time that afternoon, mainly because we were dealing with multiple scenes, we were also awaiting the arrival of PIRC and to discuss with them if they agreed with the priorities and how we were actually going to decant the equipment from the officers under sterile conditions using independent police officers not from the division but from the Major Investigation Team, and also ensuring that we had a force medical examiner there as well to check on their welfare and wellbeing prior to basically being released at that stage or prior to going off duty. So that was all -- it just took a bit of time to basically manage that.

- Q. Why was it not possible to recover the equipment at an earlier stage?
- A. It was mainly a systemic structured approach. I agreed with Stuart Houston that we would do it under sterile conditions, we would do it to ensure their privacy as well, we would do it independently from the group, so we'd bring one in at a time to do that and manage it, explain to them in detail why we were doing it so they had no doubts around about the reasons for it and that it wasn't officers that had already been involved in the investigation, so we brought Major Investigation Team

- 1 officers in to manage the recovery of some of the
- 2 individuals' property at that time.
- 3 Q. And that all took time?
- 4 A. It did take time, yes.
- 5 Q. And were you able to secure the services of independent
- 6 police officers?
- 7 A. We had -- Major Investigation Team officers came in for
- 8 it, but we still had to use one or two officers from the
- 9 neighbouring divisions that had came in to assist the
- investigation at an early stage.
- 11 Q. What were the neighbouring divisions?
- 12 A. So we were -- it would be C division, which is Central
- Scotland; it would be E division, which would be
- 14 Edinburgh; it would be J division, which is Lothian and
- the Borders.
- Q. Looking back, you've spoken about being in the canteen
- with the officers, we've heard a number of witnesses
- 18 give evidence that equipment was lying around, some of
- it was leaning against walls or on the floor, and we've
- 20 heard about a table in the canteen which had equipment
- on it from different officers.
- 22 Looking back now, do you have any concerns about the
- forensic integrity, and you've mentioned the word
- 24 "sterile", and I'm wondering if you had any concerns?
- 25 A. No. So at the time I arrived at 9 o'clock the equipment

1 had already been taken, they'd taken off their body armour and their equipment. My recollection of it 2 3 within the canteen, it was -- the majority was kind of 4 placed against a wall within the canteen area, I can't 5 recall any being on the table you're describing. I think Conrad indicated I sat down, but I didn't, 6 7 I actually just stood up and briefed the officers 8 because it was very, very quick, I was going into 9 Gold Group at that time, so did we lose anything 10 regarding evidential capture? I'm not sure we did. They were all aware we were going to basically seize the 11 12 property, the aspect of any cross-contamination had 13 already happened at that particular stage, they had been 14 together for a particular length of time, they had been 15 together at the locus at Hayfield Road, they had all obviously, on the instructions of Inspector Kay, 16 17 decanted back into the canteen area where they had been together again, and it was more important from my 18 perspective as well as through the work that 19 20 Stuart Houston done at that time that what we did do 21 thereafter was to ensure the integrity once we took involvement in it, to basically ensure that that, the 22 crime scene or the scene examination of the individual 23 24 officers was done as best as possible. At any time during that day, did anyone draw to your 25 Q.

- 1 attention a matter regarding Nicole Short's vest?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. Can I ask you about the CS and PAVA sprays which we've
- 4 heard had been discharged at the scene?
- 5 A. Yes.
- Q. What involvement, if any, did you have in determining
- 7 the strategy for recovery of those?
- 8 A. It was again just with the discussion with
- 9 Stuart Houston prior to discussing it with the PIRC
- 10 round about how we would manage that, and again Stuart
- 11 had done some research and had discussed it with various
- individuals, I'm not sure who, but round about how we
- 13 would seize it, about how he -- we would wait to detail
- 14 exactly what had been -- if it had been discharged or if
- there had been any loss from the PAVA or CS, and
- thereafter we would appropriately package that to ensure
- that there would be no aspect of any evidential loss at
- that time. But again, that whole aspect was delegated
- 19 through to Stuart Houston around the whole management of
- that.
- 21 Q. Did you have any involvement in discussing the packaging
- or the weighing of the sprays?
- 23 A. No.
- Q. Were you advised whether the sprays had been properly
- 25 recovered, packaged?

1 Α. No. 2 Have you anything written in your daybook or your policy Q. 3 file that would help us understand what was happening 4 regarding recovery of equipment, or is it simply the 5 forensic recovery strategy? Forensic strategy document, yes, and the minutes. 6 Α. 7 And the minutes. And anything else in your daybook that Q. 8 you want to draw to our attention? You remember we 9 looked at this last week. 10 Α. Yeah. It's PS18269. We looked primarily at pages 4 and 5 last 11 Q. 12 week. 13 (Pause) 14 We can see page 4 on the screen. 15 (Pause) 16 I think, I don't know if you go to the next page, which Α. 17 starts at the top "Birnie", in the right-hand one. Page 5, right-hand side, that one? 18 Q. 19 Again -- I think it's the one on from that. Α. 20 Oh, right, sorry, that will be page 6, I think. Q. 21 Α. Yes, so if you do down to number 4: "Officers' clothing -22 23 "Sterile environment. 24 "Crime scene management..." Q. And what does it say under that? 25

- 1 A. "Injuries noted."
- 2 So that was the FME aspect of it we were discussing,
- 3 that we were noting the injury.
- 4 Q. When was this written?
- 5 A. So I think this was written either prior to the
- 6 Gold Group number 2 or during the Gold Group number 2,
- 7 I think it was prior to, I think it was maybe at the
- 8 meeting with the PIRC.
- 9 Q. So we've heard that was a Gold Group meeting at 14.40?
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. And that was the first one that PIRC attended?
- 12 A. It was but there was -- we had a meeting before that and
- 13 I think it's documented in Colin Robson's book at 14.05
- and PIRC investigator McGuire's book at 14.10, there was
- a meeting prior to the Gold Group with myself and
- 16 Keith Harrower and our teams.
- 17 Q. You spoke about that last week.
- 18 A. Yeah, which thereafter led me into that Gold Group,
- 19 because I think this is potentially -- I think this is
- 20 what I noted at that time around immediate priorities.
- 21 Q. We were looking at the Gold Group minutes last week for
- the first Gold Group meeting, 11.30, PS06491. Remember
- we'd discussed this?
- 24 A. Yes, I do.
- 25 Q. Can I ask you about agenda item 9, please, and it says:

"Resources (DCS Boal/CI Shepherd)." 1 I'm interested in this agenda item. 2 3 Tell us about the connection between DCS Boal and 4 resources, please. So it looks as if that's been the more wider aspect of 5 Α. divisional resources within that particular division at 6 the time, because of the impact of the number of loci 7 8 that we had at that stage, and we were standing officers 9 by that, so uniformed officers that were usually 10 involved in the patrols within that area were tied up basically standing by various locations. 11 12 So it looks as if that's the kind of local staffing 13 issues that's been discussed and I know that was looked 14 at wider, with Garry McEwan around looking at mutual aid 15 coming in from various divisions surrounding Fife to 16 assist over not just that day but it was going to take 17 a number of days to run through this, and the high-vis 18 reassurance patrols that is your normal community impact after a critical incident, just that high-visibility, 19 20 officers on the street. 21 Q. What was DCS Boal's role in relation to resources? 22 I'm not sure exactly why she -- it would really be Α. 23 Chief Inspector Shepherd and Garry McEwan would have that, I don't know if Lesley's maybe just updated round 24 25 about some aspect to that, but it wouldn't really sit

1 with Lesley, to be honest with you. 2 Agenda item 11: Q. 3 "Media strategy/communications plan." 4 Α. Yeah. 5 This was a matter for Kate Finlay? Q. Yeah. 6 Α. Can you tell us: did you have any knowledge about how 7 Q. an allegation about an officer being stabbed had got 8 into the public domain? 9 10 Α. So my recollection, my knowledge of that is that on 11 driving through to Kirkcaldy it was on, I think it was 12 Radio Forth, I'm not sure, one of the radio channels, 13 and the information came that -- it was broadcast that 14 an incident had occurred in Kirkcaldy and an officer had 15 been stabbed, and I knew at that time from my 16 discussions with Colin that that was wholly inaccurate. 17 So I contacted the on-call comms support, which was 18 Kate Finlay, and asked her to ensure that that was 19 withdrawn immediately because of the inaccuracy of it. 20 So Kate had informed me that it hadn't came internally 21 from police, that that had come from an external source. 22 What does that mean? Q. 23 A. So it hadn't came -- we hadn't self-generated that media release, it came internally -- sorry, it had came 24

externally from elsewhere. But it certainly had been

25

- 1 broadcast that an officer had been stabbed and, as
- I say, I can actually recall I was driving over the
- 3 Forth Road Bridge at that time when I actually heard it.
- 4 But, as I say, I asked her to withdraw it immediately
- 5 because it was inaccurate.
- 6 Q. And how did you know it was inaccurate?
- 7 A. Because I had discussed through the course of the last
- 8 40 minutes with Colin Robson round about what had
- 9 occurred.
- 10 Q. And when you say internally and externally, when you
- 11 refer to internally, what do you mean?
- 12 A. So police generally, particularly for serious incidents
- or major incidents we would proactively move towards
- 14 a media release of some sort, at the early stages of any
- investigation they would produce what's called an
- "if asked" normally, which is an if asked statement, if
- 17 the media asked us for comment. It would be usually run
- by myself as SIO saying was I happy with this going out
- 19 to media. Or, if we wanted to be more proactive with
- anything at all at that stage, again through discussion
- 21 with the SIO and the comms lead, we would pull together
- thereafter a statement to be released to the media
- 23 proactively, either through a witness appeal or through
- 24 a community reassurance as such or both.
- 25 Q. So internal would be an official media statement?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Or an if asked media statement being prepared by
- 3 Police Scotland rather than an individual officer?
- 4 A. Yeah.
- 5 Q. Can I ask you to look on the some other minutes, please
- 6 PS06492 and these are the 14.40 Gold Group meeting
- 7 minutes, which was the second Gold Group meeting on
- 8 3 May. Again, we see that you were present at this, and
- 9 as we've said before, Keith Harrower from PIRC and
- 10 Keith Hardie from MIT were present for the first time.
- 11 Tell us what difference it made that PIRC were
- 12 present at this meeting.
- 13 A. I mean, it was critical, I mean, they were the lead
- investigating authority, so they had to be there,
- you know what I mean, it would have been extremely
- beneficial for them to be at the first Gold Group at
- 17 11.30, but it was -- it was critical that we had them at
- that table for that Gold Group, as I say, as being the
- 19 lead investigating authority.
- Q. Why would it have been beneficial for them to have been
- 21 at the first meeting?
- 22 A. Mainly due to the fact that they were the lead
- authority, you know what I mean, they were the lead
- 24 authority from -- on my understanding, from -- I'd been
- 25 informed at 09.35 hours by PSD, by Craig Blackhall, that

1 they had been allocated ownership of the investigation, 2 so -- and due to the fact, as I've indicated before, the 3 investigation was moving at such fast pace and I was 4 keeping Keith Harrower updated via telephone round about 5 some of the actions that were being progressed and what we had established. However, that is just simply the 6 7 investigation side, I'm speaking to Keith around the 8 whole holistic aspect of the management of a critical 9 incident and a significant investigation, until you basically sit at a Gold Group and you get that kind of 10 wider spectrum of exactly what has occurred and what 11 12 maybe some of the challenges may be. You don't really 13 get that just through the kind of single lens of looking 14 through the investigation, if that makes sense. 15 Q. Right. And then if we look at item 3, which is on page 2, do we see at this stage that DCI Houston is 16 17 identified at this point as crime scene co-ordinator? You talked about that last week. 18 19 Yeah. Α. 20 He was actually at this meeting as well? Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 So he had arrived at Kirkcaldy by this time, and then it Q. 23 says: 24 "Witness strategy." 25 Just three bullet points down from that:

"... MIT to be deployed to note statements from significant witnesses. (Update MIT to progress with investigation, ongoing discussions re witness strategy, to be discussed with PIRC, discussion re seizure of production from Police witnesses." Can you tell us about this element of the discussion? A. Yeah, so in the main that was round about any of the significant identified witnesses that became apparent.

significant identified witnesses that became apparent.

And a lot of this was down to some of the house-to-house and door-to-door parameters that we'd set at that time,

I think I discussed it last week round about if we did come across, through general house-to-house, that the PIRC wanted the option to basically deploy their own resources to some of the more significant eyewitnesses if they became apparent.

The MIT coming on board, again we had a number of MIT officers arriving through the course of -- from 10, 11 o'clock right through to the Gold Group here, so again having experienced investigators from the Major Investigation Team who were used to the protocols for a major investigation of a major crime or incident as such, was really beneficial. So it was about how we best utilised MIT resources in a line with the PIRC and looking at that response.

1	Q.	And further down you see just at what was the bottom of
2		the page:
3		"Seizure of production from officers being carried
4		out today staff have been advised by Federation
5		staff not to provide any statements."
6		Now, you gave evidence last week about your
7		understanding of the position regarding Amanda Givan's
8		evidence and the Federation advice. At the time of this
9		Gold Group meeting, did that remain your understanding
10		of the position regarding the officers and the provision
11		of statements?
12	Α.	Yes. That really didn't change at all through the
13		course of 3 May, that was the advice coming from
14		Amanda Givan.
15	Q.	We'll come back to that in a moment. Further down we
16		can start to see:
17		"[Next of kin] strategy - Partner of deceased made
18		aware and statement noted, no formal ID has taken place
19		but ID has been done via a Facebook image initially."
20		Can I ask you about that, please, the use of
21		a Facebook image and whether you have any concerns about
22		that at that stage in the day?
23	Α.	So that was carried out without my knowledge, and it was
24		under the direction of Colin Robson, this was the
25		initial discussion with Collette Bell who'd provided

25

1 a number of images of the deceased. We also had a further image through the interrogation of police 2 3 systems that we could utilise as well. So again, it was 4 having, as best as possible, the confidence that the 5 individual at the Victoria Hospital was Mr Bayoh. So again it's -- it's a more informal identification, but 6 7 to have that confidence prior to visiting the next of 8 kin that you're almost nearly 100% confident without 9 formal identification that this is the individual you're 10 basically explaining to a family that has sadly passed 11 away. 12 Q. There may be concerns that using a Facebook image is 13 a particularly informal method, and there are better 14 methods available to officers. If you had been involved 15 in this aspect, what would you have preferred to do? 16 I mean, historically it's best done, if we can, by Α. 17 images that we hold on our police systems and such if we 18 can, if the individual has been involved with the police 19 previously. Again, with the significant use of 20 social media these days, you know what I mean, a lot of 21 the times the best imagery is within some social media 22 sites around the individuals concerned. 23 So, although I wasn't involved, hadn't authorised this aspect of it, I can see why it was done; it was 24

done with the best of intentions to identify as quickly

as possible who the individual there was at the hospital, that was Mr Bayoh.

So again, that doesn't -- I mean, there's not hard and fast rules around that, as an SIO I would look at all options round about identification. I mean, the priority is to try to identify as soon as possible, and again there are a number of options. There are probably more options open now than there were 20 years ago, just because of the abundance of individuals now on social media sites. But again, it really is just that informal aspect to have and to provide the police with some sort of confidence that the information we are given is accurate.

- Q. Looking back now, do you have any concerns about the death message being relayed to Collette Bell prior to any form of identification having been carried out?
- A. I don't, and I say that having considered the reasons why we did do that. It became clear from -- after speaking -- the death message had already been delivered to Collette before I was made aware of it, but from discussion with Colin Robson, who had obviously -- who was liaising with the two officers who were dealing with Collette -- was that it was very clear to Collette at that time through the discussion that she highly suspected that the person within the hospital who was

1 deceased was her partner, and just with the information passed, Colin's decision at that time was ... he thought 2 3 it was a competent decision to deliver that message to 4 Collette as the partner of the deceased with the 5 information she had passed and the fact that she was highly aware that it was her partner that was deceased. 6 7 So, it's not something we normally do, it's 8 something that we would probably more likely go to the 9 confirmed next of kin initially around that. However, 10 I can see why Colin made the decision to deliver the message to Collette at the time. It was basically done 11 12 transparently, honestly, it was done because the fact is 13 that she had a great understanding that, from -- not 14 just from what we told her but from the information she 15 had from Mr Saeed and she was putting two and two together at that particular stage. I think it would 16 17 have been silly not to basically make her aware of it, to be honest, and, as I say, it was done with the best 18 of intentions and to be honest and transparent with 19 20 Collette round about that. 21 Q. This bullet point in the minutes goes on to say: 22 "[Next of kin] identified as sister and a FLO being identified. (2 x Police Scotland FLOs have been 23 24 identified 1 x DI as FLO to brief and co-ordinate." 25 Can you tell us what this part of the discussion was

about? 1 2 Yeah, so this was the issues we had, as I said Α. 3 previously, round about identification of the two family 4 liaison officers, the issues with the STORM/SCOPE 5 system, that we believed these people were on duty. We contacted one of the DIs, I think it was within the MIT, 6 who was tasked thereafter to try to bring family liaison 7 8 officers out as soon as possible and that's -- the role 9 that individual did was identify Kevin Houliston and one 10 other who attended thereafter within a relatively short period of time. But again, I've already highlighted 11 12 some of the challenges we had round about the family 13 liaison sort of thing. Q. The final page, I don't need to take you to it, refers 14 15 to the PIRC looking for a definitive point of contact. That's agenda item 12, which is on the final page. 16 17 We've heard evidence from you that you were a point of contact effectively for Keith Harrower on 3 May. 18 19 Yeah. Α. What does it mean: 20 Q. 21 "PIRC looking for definitive point of contact with knowledge of all circumstances"? 22 If we come up to item --23 Yeah, I can see that. 24 Α. Q. -- agenda item 12. 25

- 1 You see the second line under, "Any other business".
- 2 "PIRC looking for definitive point of contact with
- 3 knowledge of all circumstances."
- 4 A. So the initial -- the point of contact for the
- 5 investigation was myself. I think what that potentially
- 6 is looking at is PIRC were looking for a single point of
- 7 contact, it looks as if it is potentially sitting under
- 8 Garry McEwan, in respect of the wider aspect of the
- 9 community impact involvement around that. That's the
- only thing I can think of. It's quite clear, you know
- 11 what I mean, that myself and Keith were aware that I was
- 12 the single point of contact for the investigation,
- I think it's a wider aspect of the critical incident he
- 14 was looking for a point of contact and I don't know if
- that was maybe given to Chief Inspector Nicky Shepherd
- 16 at that time.
- Q. Right, there are prior entries in relation to the
- 18 community impact. Maybe we should look at those as
- 19 well. If we go back a page, we have items 6 and 7 which
- 20 talk about community issues and community impact
- 21 assessment review.
- 22 A. Yeah.
- Q. Does that assist you?
- A. Yeah, I think that's the only thing I can think of
- 25 around that, because it was clear, you know what I mean,

25

Α.

I think that's what it does.

1 from early decision with Keith at 10.20 that I was the 2 investigative lead for Police Scotland for this, so that 3 was clear and Keith said as well that -- I think it was 4 the wider aspect of the various other pillars of the 5 investigation -- the incident, that Keith was maybe looking for a point of contact with other than speaking 6 7 to someone who's dealing with community impact, speaking 8 to someone who's dealing with the equality and diversity side, speaking to someone who is dealing with the media, 9 10 I think he was maybe looking for a point of contact who could almost generalise and provide that kind of update. 11 12 Q. Last week, I think on your first day, you talked about 13 the investigation and you being bronze command of 14 that --15 Α. Yeah. -- but there being other bronze commanders --16 Q. 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. -- within that structure which dealt with different 19 issues, community, media and that type of thing. 20 Α. Yeah. 21 Q. Did you think the point of contact related to the other 22 columns --23 Yes, yeah. Α. Q. -- within that structure? 24

- Q. Can I ask you about delivery of the death message or

 death messages to the Johnsons, who were -- Kadi Johnson

 was Mr Bayoh's next of kin. What was your involvement

 in the delivery of those messages? We have heard that

 this was roughly around 3.10 in the afternoon, when

 Mitchell and Parker attended to deliver the first death

 message.
 - A. Yeah, so I think I detailed last week around the challenges with the family liaison officers being identified that were suitably trained, and thereafter about the discussion with myself and Lesley Boal that we would -- we couldn't delay it any further at that stage and we deployed two family liaison -- sorry, two police officers or detectives that were involved in the investigation.

So that information, I think it was about half past 2 or thereabouts, we asked the -- Parker, through Colin Robson, to basically attend and deliver the death message to the family, and provide the information that family liaison officers would be deployed as soon as possible to provide further information at that time around that. And thereafter we had the aspect of the death message being delivered to the family round about, I think it was about 3 o'clock, in my understanding. But thereafter the information coming back via

1 Graeme Dursley, and thereafter Colin Robson, that there 2 had been a number of significant questions asked by the 3 family -- quite rightly so -- around it, and they had 4 asked if there was any further information that we could 5 provide at that stage. Q. Could I ask you about the first death message? 6 7 Α. Yes. We have heard evidence from Mitchell and Parker and 8 Q. 9 Dursley and Robson about this. What involvement did you 10 have in deciding what to tell the Johnsons? So the information we asked to tell, inform them was the 11 Α. 12 information that we'd given to Collette Bell at the 13 time, so there was that consistent message with it. 14 That was the reason we identified Parker and his 15 colleague at that time as well, Mitchell, to deliver 16 that, so it was a consistent message that was being 17 delivered. 18 By this time you were aware that the Facebook Q. 19 identification had been carried out? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. In relation to the information which was being given to 22 Kadi Johnson at that first occasion by Mitchell and 23 Parker, we heard that there wasn't really much change between the message that had been given to 24 25 Collette Bell?

1 Α. Yeah. Did you reflect on whether more information should be 2 Q. 3 given to Kadi Johnson? Yeah. So it was really -- it's really challenging 4 Α. 5 because it does look extremely cold and the fact that we're holding information back, and I've experienced 6 7 this over a number of years in a number of 8 investigations. Ultimately we can only deliver 9 information that we have at that particular time, that 10 we're confident that we have, so again what we do deliver and what information we do give is what there 11 12 is -- there is no doubt that that is accurate and 100%, we're confident that the rationale behind it and the 13 14 information we have can be verified as such. 15 So again, it's -- it does look extremely cold, it 16 does look very, very narrow, the information we give. 17 However, it is what information we know at that 18 particular time, and at that stage we obviously still 19 have a number of different hypotheses we're running 20 through regarding the investigation at that time as 21 well. So again, there are reasons why maybe we wouldn't 22 elaborate on particular strands or particular areas at 23 that point. 24 So again -- and I mean, the priority is just to deliver the message, you know what I mean, to make them 25

1 aware at that stage, and thereafter what we're looking at is putting the family liaison officers, trained 2 3 family liaison officers in directly after that to --4 again, to engage and thereafter start to feed in some of 5 the other information that we had through the course of that later afternoon and early evening. 6 7 Were you part of a discussion in relation to that first Q. death message that went to Kadi Johnson? 8 So I was, I think, I believe, yeah. 9 Α. 10 Q. Were you -- tell us about that discussion that you had, and who was it with? 11 12 Α. Yeah, so that discussion was through myself and 13 Lesley Boal deciding that we couldn't wait any longer. 14 Keith Harrower was made aware as well and he agreed that 15 we'd just deploy as soon as reasonably practical to the family, and again I relayed that through to Colin Robson 16 and I think Colin spoke to Dursley around it at that 17 18 time. 19 We had agreed, myself and Lesley, that the two officers who delivered the original message to Collette 20 21 would be utilised and the information was we would pass 22 the same message at that time, however with the additional information that family liaison officers 23 would be deployed very shortly to provide you with some 24

further information.

25

- 1 Q. We've heard that the first death message that was delivered by Mitchell and Parker contained no 2 3 information that Mr Bayoh had died after police contact, 4 after coming into contact with officers at 5 Hayfield Road. Why was that information withheld from Kadi Johnson? 6 7 Α. So I'm not sure 100% of the wording of that first 8 message, all we did ask was the same message that was 9 delivered to Collette at that time went out to the 10 family. So again, I had left that with Colin Robson to manage that aspect of it, that there was that consistent 11 12 message across both what was delivered to Collette and 13 what was delivered to the next of kin and the family. Is it of concern to you that that information was 14 Q. 15 withheld from Kadi Johnson? So the more extended second message detailed in far more Α.
- 16 detail round about that contact and that aspect of --17
- I'll come on to that in a moment. 18 Q.
- 19 Yeah. Α.
- But looking back now, is it of concern to you that 20 Q. 21 information was withheld from Kadi Johnson about 22 Mr Bayoh having died after police contact?
- So if we had more -- if we had that -- the intention was 23 to deploy family liaison officers at that time with 24 a more extensive update that we could provide to them. 25

1 However, because of the delay with that we had to 2 deliver -- because of the passage of time, the 3 understanding, intention from myself and Lesley was 4 simply to deliver the death message and thereafter we 5 would basically provide further information a short time later by the deployment of family liaison officers. 6 7 So we were aware of the fact that the officers 8 involved in delivering the message weren't family 9 liaison trained and there was going to be potential ... 10 conflict or -- with the family with Police Scotland at that time. So again, could we have provided further 11 12 information at that stage? Possibly. As I say, what we 13 did do was look at what else -- what further information 14 within the space of within 15, 20 minutes, what else we 15 could provide to them, and that was thereafter the 16 statement which I thereafter drafted and gave to Dursley to deliver. 17 18 I'll come on to that. Why was Kadi Johnson not told Q. 19 when the first death message was relayed that Mr Bayoh 20 had died after contact with the police? 21 Α. So genuinely I'm not sure, I wasn't involved in the 22 exact wording of that, it was simply we were, there was 23 an urgency to deliver a death message to the family and that was what was delivered by Parker and Mitchell at 24 25 that time.

- Q. If you had been aware that the intention was not to
 mention that he'd died after coming into contact with
 the police, what would your view have been about that?
- A. Sorry, could you repeat?

- Q. Would you have been concerned in any way if you had been aware that when they were delivering the first death message to the Johnsons, they intended not to share with Kadi Johnson that Mr Bayoh had died after coming into contact with the police?
- A. I think the -- they had limited information at that particular stage as well, so they were simply being asked to deliver what had been delivered to Collette Bell, so I wouldn't put the blame on the particular officers. I think with hindsight could we have delivered a more extended form of words to the family such as the second death message at that initial stage? Yeah, we probably could have.

As I say, it was mainly due to the fact we were looking to inform the family as soon as possible, because of the delay which -- there is absolutely no doubt that that could have been quicker than it was at that particular stage and, as I say, there was issues with the deployment of FLOs on 3 May. But, yeah, you know what I mean, it could have been.

Q. From an SIO perspective, from the perspective of the

1 senior investigating officer, was there any reason at the time the first death message was delivered to 2 3 Kadi Johnson -- so roughly about 3.10 in the 4 afternoon -- so from your perspective at that time was 5 there any reason not to share with Kadi Johnson that Mr Bayoh had died after coming into contact with police? 6 7 Α. No, and as you'll be aware we did -- the second death 8 message was delivered very, very quickly after that, so 9 we could easily have -- I think what we had at the time 10 was we'd identified an urgency to deliver a death message to the family, the next of kin, with the 11 12 understanding that we were going to deploy family 13 liaison within that 30 minutes, half an hour or so, who 14 would provide a more extended version of exactly what 15 had occurred. So yeah, with hindsight could we have delivered that 16 second death message, a more thorough death message, 17 which again, it's still -- there was still significant 18 19 questions being asked of the officers when they 20 delivered that message -- quite rightly so as well --21 but that did probably provide a more thorough update 22 regarding the status of the investigation and where we were with it at that time. 23 Q. At that time no reason from the point of view of the 24 investigation --25

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. -- or protecting the investigation that would result in
- 3 withholding --
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. -- that information?
- From your perspective as SIO, was there any other
- 7 reason why that information would be withheld --
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. -- from Kadi Johnson?
- 10 A. The information we had at the time, a great deal of that
- 11 was in the public domain, I would imagine, at that time
- 12 anyway, it was within the community that there had been
- an incident involving the police and the deceased. So
- 14 the information we provided could have been provided at
- the first instance. There was no reason as SIO, from
- an investigative perspective, why I would have held back
- on that.
- 18 Q. Now, we discussed last week that the initial terms of
- 19 reference in the Gold Group included a reference to the
- 20 reputation of the police, and I asked you questions
- about that last week.
- 22 A. Yeah.
- 23 Q. You may appreciate that there was concern that this was
- 24 perhaps withheld, this information, with some intention
- 25 to protect the reputation of Police Scotland. Do you

- 1 have any comment about that?
- 2 A. I think sharing the information with the family probably
- 3 enhances the reputation of Police Scotland, that we're
- 4 being open and transparent. So there are two sides to
- 5 that whole reputation side of things as well as we maybe
- don't want that in the public domain just now but there
- 7 was no reason why we couldn't put that to the family in
- 8 particular, so again I think it would enhance the aspect
- 9 of the reputation at that particular time.
- 10 Q. Why would you not want that information being in the
- 11 public domain, if it enhances the transparency --
- 12 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- and perhaps trust of the family to know that; why
- 14 would it not equally enhance transparency and trust in
- 15 the public for them to know that?
- 16 A. Yeah, it would, and that's why the second death message
- 17 was delivered within 20 minutes detailing exactly what's
- in that death message, which was what we knew at that
- 19 time.
- Q. And can you -- well, let's move on to that second death
- 21 message. Can you explain why it was delivered in two
- 22 visits by Mitchell and Parker rather than simply one?
- 23 A. So the issue with the first death message is on
- 24 hindsight we should have elaborated more on what we knew
- at that particular time to the next of kin.

1 The feedback we got from -- through Dursley into Colin Robson into myself was that, was there additional 2 3 information that we could provide the family at that 4 time in respect of answering some of the questions that 5 we'd been asked. So again, at that time the discussion with myself, 6 7 Lesley Boal, Keith Harrower, was round about: well, what 8 exactly do we know just now and what can we provide? 9 And again, the three of us sat at a table and I drafted 10 out formal words around that with inputs from Keith and from Lesley Boal in respect of that. 11 12 Q. So that was -- the second death message was drafted with 13 Keith Harrower from PIRC? 14 Yes. Α. 15 DC Superintendent Lesley Boal? Q. 16 Α. Yes. And yourself? 17 Q. 18 Α. Yes. We heard evidence from DS Dursley that he'd come up and 19 Q. 20 spoken to, I think, you about --21 Α. Yeah. 22 Do you remember that? Q. No, I don't. What I do recall, I think the Gold Group 23 was ongoing at the time, the second Gold Group, and 24 25 I think Dursley had came to the door, I think

- 1 Colin Robson was in the Gold Group and had went outside and came back in and made me aware that there was 2 3 an issue, and I either went outside or went to a corner 4 of the room and discussed with Colin around it. I think 5 that's how it materialised, and thereafter I discussed it, I don't know if it was at the end of the meeting or 6 7 if we went outside or went to a different part of that 8 room and just identified that there was an issue with 9 the information that had been provided to the family at 10 that time. I've a feeling we stepped outside, myself 11 and Lesley and Keith, and managed that, managed it in 12 another part of that area, because it was during that 13 period of the Gold Group that started at 14.40, so that 14 was running at the time that this occurred, but I can 15 recall Dursley coming to the door and indicating to Colin Robson to come outside at the time around that. 16 Right. Can we have a look at PS05793, which should be 17 Q.
 - Q. Right. Can we have a look at PS05793, which should be a handwritten note. We've heard from DS Dursley that this effectively is the second death message. Do you recognise that handwritten --
- 21 A. I do, yes.

18

19

20

- Q. Whose writing's that?
- A. So the writing, with the exception of the words, "Shek"
 and "Islam", is my writing.
- Q. Right, and this is the second death message that was

1 delivered to the Johnsons that day? 2 Α. Yes. Who wrote "Shek (Islam)"? 3 Q. 4 Α. I'm not sure, I've never actually seen that, to be 5 honest with you. We can -- do you want to read out your --6 Q. 7 Α. Yeah, so: 8 "Following an incident this morning, in the 9 Hayfield Road area of Kirkcaldy, officers from 10 Police Scotland have been attempting to arrest Sheku Bayoh, during which time he has become 11 12 unconscious, conveyed to hospital by [Scottish Ambulance 13 Service] and despite best efforts by medical staff, died 14 shortly after 9 am this morning." 15 Q. And that was the combined efforts of the three of you? Yeah. I think that's maybe Lesley's notation at the 16 Α. 17 top, I'm just looking, she's changed the word, I think 18 I've handed it to her and maybe if you go just back up 19 to the top of that again. 20 Yes. Q. 21 Α. You see where, I don't think she'd been able to read my writing and she put "this" morning, as in I put: 22 "... incident this morning..." 23 24 And I think she's added that because she wasn't sure 25 what that said.

- 1 Q. So you'd written "this morning" and then she's written
- 2 it herself?
- 3 A. Yeah, I think what I've done is I've written it and then
- 4 handed it to herself and Keith to examine to see if they
- 5 were happy with it, and I think that's potentially
- 6 Lesley's writing.
- 7 Q. So it was approved by PIRC?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And that was then delivered to, was it DS Dursley, as he
- 10 indicated?
- 11 A. Or Colin Robson. I think Dursley, I think Dursley came
- in at that time and he was given it, I think, either by
- myself or via Colin. I think it was potentially handed
- by myself to him.
- Q. So this was the first occasion that a death message
- 16 mentioned that officers had been attempting to arrest
- 17 Sheku Bayoh?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Now, we've been -- we've heard evidence that there is no
- 20 copy of the first death message, no written record of
- 21 that. Would you agree with that or do you --
- 22 A. Yeah, I don't think there is.
- 23 Q. In relation to this message, correct me if I'm wrong,
- but there's a reference to it in your daybook?
- 25 A. Yes, there is.

24

25

On page 6 at the bottom. 1 Q. 2 Α. Yeah. 3 So that's PS18269, page 6. Q. 4 Α. Yeah. 5 And it's just beneath a redacted passage. Q. 6 A. Yeah. 7 Q. And it says: "Disclosure to next of kin." 8 9 And then there's an entry there. 10 Α. Yeah. Do you want to read that out, please? 11 Q. 12 A. Yeah, so: 13 "During the arrest of the male at Hayfield Road 14 around 07.15 hours this morning, the subject has become 15 unconscious and on arrival at hospital despite the best 16 efforts of medical staff has died." 17 We'll just get that on the screen. Now, that wording Q. is --18 19 Different, yeah. Α. 20 -- it's different. So explain to us how this came Q. 21 about? So that was really just my initial draft of what I was 22 Α. suggesting that would be put out, which thereafter led 23

to the wider discussion with Lesley -- DCS Boal and

DCI Keith Harrower, which thereafter led to an extension

24

25

1 of that to what was on the screen shortly, which was the message that was delivered. 2 So this was your initial draft and then it became --3 Q. 4 Α. Yeah. Q. -- the handwritten version? 5 I think it's in my policy file. 6 Α. 7 Q. Let's look at your policy file as well. So that's 8 PS17854. A. I think it's one of the actions. 9 10 (Pause) Yeah. So I think it's decision number 23. 11 12 Q. Right. Can I ask you about 14 first of all? 13 Oh, sorry it's not. That's the one for the officers. Α. 14 Can I ask you about 14, because it does talk about Q. 15 wording --16 Α. Yeah. -- changed, involving DCS Boal seems to be mentioned as 17 Q. 18 well. 19 Yeah. Α. 20 Could you read out your --Q. 21 Α. Yeah, so that is the one. This is after the first 22 message had been delivered, so it's: "Due to request for further information from next of 23

kin decision made to provide form of words indicating

incident involving Police Scotland officers. Wording

developed with DCS Boal and provided to DS Graeme..." 1 I couldn't recall his name at the time, but that's 2 DS Graeme Dursley: 3 "... for transmission to officers at locus." 4 5 So this was the second death message that is referred to Q. 6 there? 7 Α. Yes. 8 Let's see what the reasoning is just below on that page. Q. "Provide next of kin and family with further information 9 Α. 10 regarding the death of Sheku Bayoh." So had you been made aware, either by Colin Robson or 11 Q. 12 through discussion with DSI Dursley, that the family had 13 been concerned and were asking a number of questions? Yeah, yeah and as I previously stated that's why we went 14 Α. 15 for the second message. Looking at the second death message, and we can have the 16 Q. 17 handwritten version back on screen if you wish, can I ask you about the content of that? This is the first 18 19 time there has been mention of police contact. 20 Α. Yeah. 21 Q. There we are. There's mention that he became 22 unconscious and was taken by hospital -- sorry, by 23 ambulance to ... Scottish Ambulance Service and despite best efforts by the medical staff died shortly after 24 9.00. 25

We've discussed that death message with Mitchell and
Parker and others, Dursley and Robson. Looking at that
now, what are your views about whether that -- it
clearly shared more information, but do you think that
shared sufficient information with the family?

- A. So it was based, as I stated previously, on the information I had at the time that I could verify. So the aspect, the incident this morning, location of where it occurred, the actions of Police Scotland officers to the best of my knowledge, what I had at that time, the fact he had become unconscious at the locus, conveyed to hospital by Scottish Ambulance Service and he had died within the hospital despite the best efforts, so the five main areas of what I knew at that particular time.
- Q. Looking back now at the way the death messages were delivered, we've heard evidence from Collette Bell that she was told that Mr Bayoh had been found dead, she gave evidence about having made reference to a passer-by having found Mr Bayoh. She left the office, police office, under the impression he'd been murdered, she knew nothing of him having been conveyed by ambulance and having died after medical staff intervened. We've heard evidence from Kadi Johnson about the first death message and differences between what Collette was told and what she was told, and then we see this third death

1 message with more information. 2 In hindsight, from looking back on how these death 3 messages were relayed to the family and to 4 Collette Bell, do you have any comments to make about 5 how that could have been done differently? I mean, it's such a significant aspect of any 6 Α. 7 investigation that you get that information right and 8 there is a consistent message throughout your engagement with the family at all times, I can't -- what the 9 10 officers told to Collette Bell, I'm aware of Collette Bell's evidence, but I find it unlikely that 11 12 officers would have said something like that in the knowledge that they had, and again the first -- the 13 14 message to the family was extremely brief and short 15 with, as I say, with the rationale in my head and Lesley's that we would deploy family liaison almost 16 17 immediately. But that could have done -- we could have 18 basically said this set of words to -- and I take your 19 point around that, this could have been the death 20 message initially to the family and not simply that 21 Mr Bayoh had passed away. 22 So you can only base it on the information you have 23 at that time, and again it does appear cold, it appears it's not transparent and it appears that there's other 24 information that we may have that we're holding back on, 25

- 1 I can understand all that. However, I based what I had 2 there on what I knew at the particular time. There was 3 very little more that I knew at that stage, to be honest 4 with you, to give the family. 5 So from the perspective of SIO --Q. 6 Α. Yeah. 7 Q. -- and from the perspective of the investigation --8 Α. Yeah. -- and integrity of the investigation, this second death 9 Q. 10 message as delivered to the Johnsons could have been 11 delivered to Collette Bell in the morning; is that what 12 you're saying? 13 I obviously wasn't there at the time, and I had no Α. 14 control over that, because that was done without my 15 knowledge, so ... As SIO do you see any --Q. Yeah, no --17 Α.
- 16
- 18 Q. -- information in here that couldn't have been shared 19 with Collette Bell in the morning?
- So at that stage in the morning we are really just 20 Α. 21 getting a grip on exactly what's occurred, so Collette's with us I think about quarter to 10 to about 11 o'clock, 22 I believe, and again, that is such an early part of the 23 investigation, it's limited to what we know at that 24 25 stage. By the time we delivered this at 3 o'clock or

- thereabouts, we had filled in significant gaps in respect of the timeline and the movements of the deceased.
- Q. Looking at this message, is there any information in this message that wasn't available to you in the morning?
- 7 A. No.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 8 Q. Is there any reason that this information couldn't have
 9 been shared with Collette Bell in the morning?
- Probably not. However, we were looking at obviously 10 Α. discussing in more detail with the next of kin at the 11 12 time, as I say, it was unusual that we would -- the 13 first person we made aware of the death of Mr Bayoh was 14 the partner, which is unusual, but again just with the 15 circumstances I can understand why they did do it. So it was unusual and the information they gave was 16 17 extremely brief at that time.

Now, that may have been one of two things. One, that the officers delivering the message weren't fully aware of exactly what's contained within this death message, I mean, they're speaking to her at 10 o'clock in the morning or 10.30, and again the direction with Colin Robson may have been something different at that particular stage, prior to him making me aware that they had delivered that death message. So there's no reason

25

1		why it couldn't have been, the information was known at
2		that particular stage, if that answers your question.
3	Q.	Yes, thank you.
4		You talked about you used the word "consistent",
5		and I'm interested in your experience of death messages.
6		We've heard that the first death message to Collette
7		not to Collette, sorry, to the Johnsons wasn't noted
8		down, and I'm interested in whether your understanding
9		is that death messages are not normally written down?
10	Α.	No, I mean, they are and they aren't, to be honest with
11		you, there's no hard and fast rule with them, you know
12		what I mean, a lot of times that's the normal course of
13		the duty of a police officer, whether that's a uniform
14		officer on patrol who's sent to inform a family of
15		a death of a family member, maybe in another part of the
16		UK or elsewhere. They will simply be told the
17		information they have is that he has passed away and can
18		they make contact with such and such, so again that
19		information would be very, very limited at that time.
20		In respect of a major crime investigation, it is
21		normally kind of written down, nine times out of ten
22		it's written down, to be honest with you, the first
23		death message which is delivered by again usually
24		detectives prior to the involvement of the family

liaison officers, they would basically run it through

24

25

1 the SIO or the deputy SIO around the fact that this is what they're intending to deliver as such. 2 3 So again, in my experience, it normally is written 4 down what is delivered to the family at that time. 5 And in terms of ensuring consistency, if that message is Q. 6 shared with more than one member of the family or next 7 of kin --Yeah. 8 Α. -- or partner, how does writing it down assist with 9 Q. 10 that? It's a form of words, it's a form of words that are 11 Α. 12 there are to basically deliver that consistent message. 13 So I suppose the flipside of that, if it's not written Q. 14 down anywhere, how do you ensure that consistency? 15 Α. Well, in respect of this one we ensured -- the 16 consistency was we ensured that the officers who 17 delivered the original death message to Collette delivered the same wording and the same message to the 18 next of kin initially for that death message. 19 I'd like to move on to look at the minutes for 20 Q. 21 a Gold Group meeting the next day, if I may --22 Α. Yeah. Q. -- just to complete this. So this is PS03161. Sorry, 23

I've rushed too far ahead. I'm interested in looking at

the 2015 Gold Group minutes, which are PS06493. Sorry,

1 we will come back to that one. Again, this, I think you gave evidence about this 2 3 last week, that there was a Gold Group meeting at 8.15 4 in the evening? 5 Α. Yeah. And again you attended, Houston attended, and I think if 6 Q. 7 we move down the page we'll see that PIRC were also 8 there, and so were MIT and John Ferguson, who was also 9 from PIRC as I understand it? 10 Α. John was, yeah. If we could look at page 2, agenda item 3, please, I'm 11 Q. 12 interested in -- sorry, let's move further down. Let's 13 look at 5. Family concerns. It says -- thank you, we 14 were there: 15 "Chief Superintendent McEwan discussed brother-in-law of deceased, he is part of an independent 16 17 advisory group and had advised the initial attending 18 officers that he knew Mr McEwan and requested that he attend and speak to him within 24 hours. 19 20 "Chief Sup and Chief Insp Shepherd attended at home 21 address of [next of kin], highly charged environment, 22 deceased's partner Collette and extended family within, family concerned that early contact they had was 23 purposely vaque. They were unhappy they had not been 24 25 told anything about who contacted the Police and

1	Ambulance. Chief Sup provided them with
2	an understanding of events. Chief Sup discussed the
3	role of the PIRC and reassured them it would not be
4	P Division officers investigating the incident.
5	"TASK Family crave reassurance and are asking
6	about witnesses etc they do not wish anything publicised
7	until they inform deceased Mother who is in London."
8	Then if we can just move on to the next page, it
9	goes on:
LO	"Discussed that police did not know [next of kin]
11	whilst Collette was at Police Station.
12	"Chief Sup discusses initial decision to have
13	Police Scotland FLOs but now hand over to PIRC FLOs for
L 4	arrangement to gain entry to house of deceased re
15	collecting belongings for child. Discussion re initial
L 6	contact on phone from PIRC.
L7	"Chief Sup discusses family desperate to know about
L8	PM, and also arrangements on having them conveyed to
19	mortuary in Edinburgh.
20	"TASK To address all family issues raised."
21	I'd like to go through this agenda item with you, if
22	you don't mind, and ask you some questions, if we move
23	back to the top please.
24	Tell us about the discussion in relation to the
25	visit by Chief Superintendent McEwan.

1 Α. Yeah, so that was, Chief Superintendent McEwan discussed at the conclusion of the second Gold Group with --2 3 there's a small group: myself, the Chair, ACC Nicholson, 4 DCS Boal were present, I think Nicky Shepherd was 5 potentially there as well, and Garry had indicated or DCI Chief Superintendent McEwan had indicated that he 6 7 was aware of the brother-in-law of the deceased, and 8 that also came back from the two officers who had 9 delivered the second death message that a family member 10 had asked for Mr McEwan to make contact with the family or provide them with some further information at that 11 12 time. 13 So when they returned, the two officers, to 14 Kirkcaldy that information was passed through Dursley to 15 Colin Robson to myself, that they had actually requested or suggested that Garry makes contact with them, Chief 16 17 Superintendent McEwan to basically provide them with some other information around that. That was due to 18 19 they knew each other from I think a previous -- a forum 20 within Fife. 21 So that's -- that discussion took place and this was 22 the aspect of the -- we were aware of the kickback and the resistance from the family round about 23 24 Police Scotland officers being involved in any aspect of 25 this at the conclusion of delivering the second death

1 message and the decision had been made by myself and 2 Lesley, that there was no point at that time deploying 3 Police Scotland FLOs -- I think I provided that 4 information previously -- because of that resistance, 5 and it would be more beneficial that we simply deploy FLO -- FLOs from PIRC when they do attend, and I know 6 7 DSI Keith Harrower was trying at that time to get PIRC 8 FLOs to attend that evening around that. 9 But Garry had offered to attend, 10 Chief Superintendent McEwan had offered to attend at the family home with Chief Inspector Shepherd and tried to 11 12 basically answer some of the difficult questions that 13 they had and that was agreed by the ACC, he agreed that 14 that may well be beneficial at this stage. As I say, 15 it's unusual for a Chief Superintendent to attend at the next of kin's home address, or the silver commander as 16 17 Garry was, but, as I say, I could see the rationale 18 behind that. 19 And was that a reflection of the nature of the family's Q. 20 concerns and the contact that we've heard Ade Johnson 21 had with Garry McEwan? 22 I think it was both, I think it was the previous Α. relationship that they had but also it just wasn't 23 appropriate at that time to deploy Police Scotland FLOs, 24 25 and myself and Lesley agreed with that, just because of

- 1 the resistance that had basically came from them.
- 2 Q. And was that resistance or concern from the family only
- 3 about Fife police officers or was it any police
- 4 officers?
- 5 A. I think it was Police Scotland officers in general, but
- 6 in particular Fife officers, because of the nature of
- 7 the incident, but I think that was what was -- you know,
- Fife officers are Police Scotland officers.
- 9 Q. And we have heard that there may have been investigators
- in PIRC who are former police officers?
- 11 A. Yeah.
- 12 Q. Was that a concern of the family's that you were aware
- of in relation to PIRC as well?
- A. No, I wasn't aware of that, no.
- Q. And you'll see there that it says:
- "Chief Sup [that's Garry McEwan] provided them with
- an understanding of events. Chief Sup discussed the
- 18 role of the PIRC and reassured them [the family] it
- 19 would not be P Division officers investigating the
- 20 incident."
- 21 A. Yeah.
- Q. What area did P Division cover?
- 23 A. That was Fife, that was Kirkcaldy and the surrounding
- Fife area.
- Q. So not just Kirkcaldy police officers?

- 1 A. No.
- Q. Lochgelly, Cupar, officers from there?
- 3 A. Mm-hm.
- Q. When he reassured the family it would not be P Division
- 5 officers investigating the incident, what awareness was
- there within the Gold Group that in fact there were
- 7 officers from P Division helping with the investigation?
- 8 A. So I think Garry's referring to the fact that he knew at
- 9 that stage it was going to Major Investigation Team
- officers, so it was going to the MIT, and that there
- 11 wouldn't be any P Division officers involved in it
- whatsoever and it would be PIRC led, so I think that's
- 13 why he can reassure them that there wouldn't be anyone
- 14 involved, within that division, in the investigation.
- 15 Q. I'm interested in, we talked last week about it being
- 16 PIRC-led?
- 17 A. Yeah.
- 18 Q. But you talked about the fact they only had four or five
- investigators --
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 21 Q. -- who were brought to Kirkcaldy to deal with the
- 22 matter, and as I understood your evidence last week, you
- 23 were talking about police officers continuing to be
- 24 a resource that PIRC would rely on in carrying out --
- 25 A. Yes.

from the enquiry.

23

24

25

1 Q. -- the investigation. Was there a view that P Division officers should not 2 3 be involved in the investigation? 4 Α. No, not at that stage, no. I mean, the following -- the 5 4 May we moved on to the MIT, I mean, in a numbers --Major Investigation Teams came in in numbers to manage 6 7 the investigation with PIRC. As I said in previous 8 evidence, is that there were a number of P Division 9 officers not from the Kirkcaldy area but had came in 10 from elsewhere and P Division were managing critical actions. 11 12 So they continued doing that for the first day 13 around that, and I was more than content they were there 14 with it. However, the eventual end game with this is 15 that after 3 May we were going to move to a complete PIRC-led, MIT-supported investigation for the entirety. 16 So on 3 May P Division officers did continue --17 Q. 18 Α. Yes. 19 -- to be involved, but the following day, 4 May, you say Q. 20 there were no P Division officers involved? 21 Α. Yeah, there may have been one or two, just to basically 22 tidy up one or two actions that they were involved in,

but in general we were removing all P Division officers

Q. So when you say tidying up on the 4th, what sort of

59

1 things do you mean? 2 They may have -- without going into individual officers Α. and what actions they had at this time it's difficult to 3 4 say. I mean, an action may require further 5 investigation to eliminate what your action has been 6 asked. So if you are asked to -- such as "Eliminate 7 Pat Campbell from the investigation", you know what I mean, it's maybe checking his statements, CCTV, the 8 movements, corroboration of his movements. 9 10 So again, there may be other aspects that they would 11 be asked just to conclude that action around what they 12 had at that time. But again, the intention, as I say, 13 was that we would not utilise P Division officers for the investigation itself. 14 15 Q. So the intention was there but perhaps P Division officers did continue for a period of time --16 Yeah, yeah. 17 Α. 18 -- to complete actions? Q. 19 That discussion was at an early stage between myself and Α. Lesley Boal round about the intention was to attempt to 20 21 utilise Police Scotland detectives from outwith the Fife 22 area and that was an earlier discussion with Lesley, 23 you know what I mean, when I was made aware of it, that that whole transparency, the kind of independent aspect 24

of our role -- I had no concerns with the P Division

25

1 officers but just how -- you know, through the lens how 2 that may look as such. 3 So, as I say, there was an early discussion with 4 myself and Lesley around that but due to the fact that 5 resources were tight in the early part of the investigation and some of the P Division officers from 6 7 outwith Kirkcaldy had really significant actions round 8 about Collette Bell, round about one or two of the other 9 significant witnesses, we -- my take on that is that we 10 would continue with them and in respect to that, I didn't see anything around any integrity issues with 11 12 it. 13 When you use the phrase how it would look "through the Q. 14 lens" --15 Α. Yeah. -- what would the concerns be, as far as you were aware? 16 Q. I think there was a -- what we were almost pre-empting 17 Α. 18 was the fact what we were moving towards on day two 19 would be a completely independent investigation from 20 P -- without P Division officers having any footprint on 21 it at all. So day one, early stages, you're going to 22 have that -- the aspect of local officers still being involved in it but with the intention that eventually 23 you move towards an investigation solely resourced from 24 25 a Police Scotland perspective by Major Investigation

- Team officers which would support the PIRC-led investigation.
- Q. When was the point reached, as far as you're aware,
 where you were satisfied that no P Division officers
 were involved in the investigation?
- A. So I was involved in it for the first two days.

 I couldn't answer that, to be honest with you, I'm not sure, but I know that that's where we were moving towards, but, as I say, one day just merged into the other day, as you can imagine.
- 11 Q. In terms of the remit of PIRC, we talked last week about
 12 that --
- 13 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- and how we may -- we will hear further evidence about
 this, but it may be that there were five letters from
 the Crown Office extending the remit of PIRC over
 a period of time?
- 18 A. Right.
- Q. What clarity did you have on 3 or 4 May as to the precise remit and scope of the investigation to be carried out by PIRC?
- A. So my understanding, and I hadn't seen the terms of reference that you're referring to there, was that the PIRC were the lead investigation and would examine the lead-up to the death of Mr Bayoh as well as the

1 subsequent actions of the response to his death. That was my initial understanding for day one and day two, 2 3 what their remit was. There were other aspects that may 4 well fall into Police Scotland officers round about, 5 I mean, the background or whatever, but that whole focus on the incident at Hayfield Road and the subsequent 6 7 response around that was quite clear in my head that 8 that sat with PIRC leading on it. Q. But in terms of having a clear picture available to you 9 10 as to what parts of the investigation may remain with Police Scotland --11 12 Α. Yeah. 13 -- and what parts were handed over to PIRC --Q. 14 Α. Yes. 15 -- looking back now, do you feel that you had a clear Q. picture in your mind of what parts perhaps remained with 16 Police Scotland and what parts were handed over? 17 18 Yeah, I mean, it was clear that, I mean, we were Α. 19 supporting PIRC from the early morning of 3 May, it was 20 their investigation, we were simply supporting it, we 21 had the assets on the ground at that time to manage it. The -- I don't think the terms of reference and the 22 visibility of the terms of reference from 23 a Police Scotland perspective came until potentially the 24 end of day two, day three, and I think that was into 25

1 Keith Hardie, who had taken over my role as such around 2 it. But certainly I had no visibility at all of what 3 the terms of reference were. We were running with the 4 priorities which we've already discussed around that but 5 the more detailed aspect of how the kind of choreography of the investigation would thereafter play out was 6 7 something that would be managed between PIRC and the 8 Major Investigation Teams more than myself as responding 9 to it. 10 Q. So you talked last week about was it the golden hour or the golden hours? 11 12 Α. Yeah. 13 And during that period, is that a fixed period or is Q. 14 it ...? 15 Α. It can last more than an hour. During that period, was it essentially Police Scotland 16 Q. 17 that were doing --18 A. Yes. 19 Q. -- the investigation? 20 A. Yes. MS GRAHAME: I wonder if that would be a --21 LORD BRACADALE: A convenient point? Well, we'll take 22 a 20-minute break. 23 24 (11.30 am)25 (A short break)

1 (11.55 am)2 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Can I ask you: was there a formal handover to 3 4 PIRC in the morning? You were made aware they were 5 taking the lead in the investigation, and I'm interested in whether there was some sort of formal handover at 6 7 that stage or did that happen later? Are you talking about 10.22 when I speak to 8 Α. 9 Keith Harrower? 10 Q. Yes, you had that initial conversation with Keith Harrower at that time in the morning. 11 12 Yeah. So, I mean, it was clear -- Keith obviously Α. 13 informed me at that time that he had been instructed to 14 lead on the investigation by Crown Office, so it was 15 clear -- it was clearer to me before that, to be honest with you, I had been informed at 9.45 by Craig Blackhall 16 17 who had had that discussion with Dave Green from Crown Office and Craig had contacted me back to inform 18 19 me that PIRC would lead on the investigation, so at 20 10.20 when Keith contacted me, Keith just reinforced the 21 fact it was going to be PIRC-led. 22 And what about a formal handover where you give Q. a briefing? 23 Yeah. So that really didn't happen until, through the 24 Α. course of the day, you know what I mean, the PIRC attend 25

1 at 13.30, 13.35 hours, we get into an investigative briefing at that time, thereafter into a Gold Group, 2 3 thereafter into a forensic strategy meeting, and 4 thereafter a further Gold Group that evening. So 5 that -- the enquiry was still, although being led by Keith as a lead investigator for PIRC, was heavily 6 7 supported by myself and my resources from 8 Police Scotland at that time, and I didn't actually do a handover in respect of my role to Keith Hardie, the 9 10 DCI from the MIT, until I think it was the second day after the post-mortem examination. So I continued with 11 12 that involvement all the way through the second day as 13 well. 14 But it was clear round about the -- and again, that 15 whole aspect, the question you're asking about a formal handover, that was a kind of gradual progress through 16 17 the different forums and meetings and the progression of the investigation around the fact once HOLMES, the 18 HOLMES team were into the investigation on day two and 19 20 that more defined structure round about PIRC-led, fully 21 supported by MIT, was thereafter going to take the 22 investigation on over the coming days and weeks. So if we look at your policy file, I think you gave 23 Q. evidence last week about the handover to Keith Hardie 24 from MIT --25

24

25

1 Α. Yeah. -- and I think is that at the rear of your policy file? 2 Q. 3 Α. Yeah, yeah. It may be decision number 22, if I'm right. I may be 4 Q. 5 wrong on that. No, it's not that one. 6 (Pause) 7 So it's -- I think Keith's detailed it ... 24 is --Α. 8 Q. 24? 9 Yeah, and then 25 is Keith basically indicating that 10 that's the meeting that handovers occurred with Keith Harrower -- sorry, with Keith Hardie. 11 12 Q. So 24 mentions Chief Superintendent Garry McEwan? 13 Sorry, decision 20 ... Α. 14 Q. Sorry --15 Sorry, I'm at 29, it is, sorry. Α. 16 Q. Sorry. Sorry, it's just my writing. 17 Α. Q. No, not at all. So decision number 29, page 61478. And 18 19 what does that say? 20 A. It's: 21 "Handover meeting with Detective Super --It's actually DCI: 22 "... Keith Hardie at Livingston Police Office." 23

Q. So that's the official handover to Keith Hardie at MIT?

A. So it actually happened the previous evening on the 4th,

- however, it just basically ran into the morning of the

 5th, and the morning of the 5th I met Keith out at

 Livingston Police Office and we sat down and had

 a coffee and did a more thorough handover in respect of

 some of the areas that we were going to concentrate on

 at that time and some of the work that had been carried

 out so Keith had a full understanding of where we were.
- Q. Tell me when the handover with Keith Hardie was the previous day, that wasn't a formal handover then?
- 10 Α. No, it was -- it was during the progress of the evening of the 4th, there was a meeting after the post-mortem 11 12 examination results came through, I think it was round about 19 ... 19.30, 19.35, it was a meeting between --13 14 what had actually happened on that day was that the PIRC 15 had changed on the 4th, the lead investigator, so Keith Hardie stood down, I think he was on annual leave, 16 I'm not sure. 17
- 18 Q. Harrower?
- 19 A. Harrower, sorry, and Billy Little took on that role so.
- Q. I think you mentioned that last week?
- A. Yeah, so basically what happened with that was

 Keith Hardie and Billy Little had attended the

 post-mortem examination and Keith had contacted me with

 the result. Thereafter we did -- I'd arranged a meeting

 with Billy Little back at the -- back at Kirkcaldy

1 Office that evening, I think it took place prior to the last Gold Group meeting and that was really just a kind 2 3 of more definitive handover with PIRC at that stage 4 because Keith -- sorry --Billy Little? 5 Q. -- Billy Little was coming on to it at that point. 6 Α. 7 So that was the 4th, the day after? Q. 8 I think it was the evening of the 4th, the day after, Α. 9 yeah. 10 Q. Do you remember what time that handover was? I think it was 19.30. It may be detailed in my actual 11 Α. 12 policy file actually. I was going to ask you, is --13 Q. 14 A. 28th. I think it's 28th: 15 "Meeting with PIRC new lead Billy Little regarding the scope of the investigation to date." 16 17 And then: "Instruction from DCS Boal/ACC Nicholson that 18 19 enquiry will now rest with the MIT SIO Detective Super." 20 But it was actually DCI Keith Hardie that was the 21 lead on it. Right, so there was a meeting with the new lead, 22 Q. Billy Little, that was 4 May? 23 Yes, the evening of the 4th, after the post-mortem 24 Α. 25 examination.

- 1 Q. After the post-mortem and before the Gold Group meeting?
- 2 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. Or maybe there wasn't -- did you just say there was
- 4 a Gold Group meeting on the evening of the 4th?
- 5 A. Yeah, 19.15 or 20.15, I think there was a 20.15 one.
- 6 Q. I thought that was on 3 May?
- 7 A. Ah, sorry, the 3rd, yeah. Sorry. No, 4 May was the
- 8 post-mortem in the afternoon and there was a meeting
- 9 with myself and PIRC on the evening at Kirkcaldy Office
- 10 at 19.30 with Billy Little and some of the PIRC reps
- 11 round about a more thorough kind of handover with Billy
- 12 at that time.
- Q. So that was the handover to Billy Little, who was taking
- on the lead role for PIRC. What about an official
- 15 handover to Keith Harrower?
- 16 A. Yeah.
- 17 Q. He was for PIRC on 3 May?
- 18 A. Yeah, so that morning a thorough investigative handover
- 19 was prior to the second Gold Group round about
- 20 14.00 hours on 3 May, that was a meeting I explained
- 21 round about my team, plus Keith's team and round about
- 22 that these are the investigative priorities and this is
- 23 where we are with it, just bringing Keith and the team
- fully up to date with where we are with things.
- 25 Q. So PIRC arrive at Kirkcaldy at roughly half past one?

- 1 A. Yeah, yeah.
- 2 Q. You go into a meeting with PIRC, that's the handover to
- 3 PIRC as far as you're concerned?
- A. So it was very clear in my head from 9.30 that this was
- 5 PIRC-led, you know what I mean, I think round about the
- 6 mechanics and the priorities and all that had all been
- 7 discussed through the course of the morning with Keith,
- 8 although remotely, but this was the first time we'd
- 9 actually been able to sit round a table and discuss it
- in detail.
- So round about handover as such, I was always aware
- that they were leading on it. I mean, it's Keith's
- 13 ultimate decision round about the actions and priorities
- and anything to do with the investigation, but round
- about that more thorough full investigative update came
- 16 prior to the Gold Group meeting.
- Q. So if we're thinking about a handover where you hand
- 18 over responsibility --
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. -- of the investigation to PIRC, when did that take
- 21 place?
- 22 A. So I would suggest it was before the Gold Group meeting,
- the 14.40 one, round about that investigative handover
- 24 whereby Keith is actually at Kirkcaldy Office leading on
- 25 the investigation in person with the support from myself

- 1 and my team around that, so --
- Q. And is that Keith Harrower?
- 3 A. Keith Harrower, yeah.
- 4 Q. And they're in Kirkcaldy at that time?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. So is that handover noted in the policy file?
- 7 A. I don't think it is, but, as I say, it was -- it was
- 8 very clear in both our heads that at 10 o'clock, 10.30,
- 9 when Keith phones me at 10.22, that they were leading on
- it, it wasn't a case of handing over as such, they were
- 11 always leading on it from very early that morning, it
- was just a case of a more -- a further investigative
- 13 update to ensure they were fully sighted on all aspects
- of the investigation to date.
- But as in an official handover, it was clear from
- 9.30 in the morning to me that this was not
- 17 Police Scotland-led, this was PIRC-led, but they did
- 18 require significant support around it.
- 19 Q. Looking back now, do you think that having a formal part
- of the process where there was an official handover and
- 21 setting out the scope of what was being handed over
- 22 would maybe have assisted?
- 23 A. I don't think so, I think from the investigative
- 24 priorities and the areas under my control at that early
- 25 stage in the handover I don't see really anything at all

- 1 we could have done any better, with the exception of the
- family liaison aspect of it which we've already
- discussed.
- 4 Q. And --
- 5 A. I think -- sorry, I think the problem with the PIRC
- 6 deployment at that stage, other than the resources, is
- 7 that over the course of 24, 36 hours they changed the
- 8 lead investigator. So Keith had --
- 9 Q. What issues did that cause?
- 10 A. Just obvious challenges, the fact is you're bringing
- someone on fresh into the investigation when you've been
- there for 12, 13 hours at that stage, you know what
- I mean, before that ... before Billy Little's appointed
- 14 around that. So again, there was challenges with the
- fact that the change of a senior investigator from PIRC
- 16 at such an early stage of a critical investigation would
- 17 undoubtedly cause challenges.
- Q. When you use the word "challenges" can you give us
- an example, what do you mean?
- 20 A. Just a natural awareness of the investigation and where
- 21 the priorities lay, and some of the issues that we'd
- 22 came across during the course of 3 May from the early
- 23 morning right through to the evening, as well as
- 24 obviously the challenges with the family liaison and
- some of the problems we'd encountered that day.

24

25

1 So again, what we had was that Keith Harrower had been fully briefed on it through the course of that 2 3 morning into the afternoon, into the evening, and 4 thereafter we have a change of senior investigator from 5 the PIRC side which, to be honest with you, if we'd done that with Police Scotland and we'd changed our SIO after 6 7 day one it causes the same problems because it leads to 8 potential confusion, it leads to more additional 9 briefings having to be given to who's came in to take on 10 that particular role. So, as I say, it's probably not the best practice in respect of how you run 11 12 an investigation. 13 Is that the type of thing that Police Scotland would do, Q. 14 change a senior investigator --15 Α. So we would normally do a handover now at this stage. In 2015 we were in the very early stages of it whereby 16 17 the majority of homicides and extended investigations 18 would normally sit with the Major Investigation Team, so what would happen, and what did usually happen, is that 19 20 I would go out and deal with the initial stages of 21 a homicide and within a couple of days I would do 22 a handover to the Major Investigation Team to basically thereafter take the investigation on, which would 23

So that's the way it does work with Police Scotland,

probably run for a number of weeks or months.

- 1 but the initial stages is still with the on-call detective super or a detective chief super who would see 2 3 that aspect of it, but a great majority of the 4 investigations, unless the homicide is quickly resolved, 5 they normally fall with the Major Investigation Teams to 6 take primacy on. 7 And that's within a couple of days did you say? Q. 8 Α. Yeah. Why was, if you have awareness of this, why was 9 Q. 10 Billy Little not involved on 3 May? I genuinely don't know. As I say, I was given no 11 Α. indication by DSI Keith Harrower that he was intending on not being there on the 4th as such, so I don't
- indication by DSI Keith Harrower that he was intending
 on not being there on the 4th as such, so I don't
 actually know why that was. Something in my mind makes
 me think he was going on annual leave, but I'm unsure on
 that, I don't know how I got that information, but
 that's maybe came from Billy Little.
- Q. Was it a surprise to you that he wasn't there on the second day?
- A. Yeah, yeah, I wasn't, I wasn't -- I think I'd been made

 aware on the evening of the 3rd, but again I can't

 recall exactly who made me aware of that, but I was -
 I knew Billy Little was coming on to run the

 investigation from the PIRC side.
- 25 Q. And how were you feeling about this change in PIRC of

1 their senior investigator?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- It really didn't make any, any significant ... of note 2 Α. 3 to me. There was nothing at all -- I mean, it was just 4 a case that I would have to now go back and brief the 5 new DSI coming on, although there is absolutely no doubt Keith Harrower would have gave Billy quite an extensive 6 7 handover, I would imagine, you know what I mean, in 8 respect of that, and that was clear when I spoke to 9 Billy Little, he was aware of the work that had been 10 progressed over that period of time. But, as I say, it's -- I think it was mainly due to the kind of 11 12 personal circumstances of Keith Harrower, he was 13 finishing after that particular day, which I think it 14 was potentially a pre-planned holiday that he had or 15 whatever, so again from my own perspective it really didn't matter that much to be honest. 16
 - Q. When Billy Little came in on the 4th, did he change any of the decisions that had been made or priority actions that had been identified?
 - A. I don't recall. However, I had a briefing, I had a -I chaired a joint -- I think we've seen the document
 minutes, I chaired a meeting with -- which was
 an investigative meeting on the morning of the 4th round
 about 10 o'clock and I'm sure Billy Little was at that
 with a number of other PIRC resources who had attended

1 that morning, as well as Police Scotland MIT resources. I can't recall him changing anything --2 3 Q. Right. 4 Α. -- at this stage. Again, I may be wrong on that. 5 Can I go back to the minutes of the evening meeting of Q. the Gold Group at 20.15. We were looking at that just 6 7 before the break. PS06493. I hadn't quite completed 8 the questions I wanted to ask you about that. Can we 9 look at item 5 again, please, that's the bottom of 10 page 2, I think. So it says there: "TASK -- Family crave reassurance and are asking 11 12 about witnesses etc they do not wish anything publicised 13 until they inform deceased Mother who is in London." 14 Then if we can go on to the next page, paragraph 3: 15 "Chief Sup discusses Family desperate to know about [post-mortem], and also arrangements on having them 16 17 conveyed to mortuary in Edinburgh." 18 And: "TASK -- To address all family issues raised." 19 20 Can I ask you about the nature of this part of the 21 discussion at the Gold Group meeting, about the family's 22 concerns? A. Yeah. So the family concerns were obviously around --23 as it states there, round about the post-mortem 24 25 arrangements and how quick that they'd actually been put

1 in place for the following day, and that's what's detailed there with -- we have Chief Superintendent 2 3 Garry McEwan coming --Can I stop you there? 4 Q. 5 Α. Yeah. When you say they were concerned about how quick the 6 Q. 7 post-mortem had been put in place the following day, 8 we've heard evidence that the family didn't know that 9 the post-mortem was going to take place on 4 May until 10 they found out on 5 May, in the morning. So can you think back to this discussion, which is at 20.15 on 11 12 3 May, and tell us what your recollection of that 13 discussion is? Yeah, so the discussion at that time was that the family 14 Α. 15 liaison for the post-mortem arrangements would sit solely with PIRC at that stage because of the challenges 16 17 that we had from Police Scotland perspective, and that resulted in obviously following this we had 18 19 Keith Harrower contacting the family via telephone and 20 thereafter arranging to visit the family to make them 21 aware of the arrangements for the post-mortem 22 examination and that we would be requiring family members for identification. So I'm unsure exactly what 23

Keith explained to the family round about the

arrangements for the post-mortem examination.

24

Keith Harrower? 1 Q. 2 Keith Harrower, yeah, but that aspect of it following Α. 3 this Gold Group sat solely with PIRC, the deployment of 4 family liaison officers to the family from PIRC, and not 5 Police Scotland, and the liaison with the family in its entirety would sit with PIRC and not with 6 7 Police Scotland at that time. 8 Q. Subject of course to any other arrangements through 9 Chief Superintendent McEwan? 10 Α. So there wasn't any other arrangements. There wasn't anything else? 11 Q. 12 Α. No. 13 So where it says "Task" at the end of item 5 --Q. 14 Α. Yeah. 15 -- "To address all family issues raised." Q. That was a task to be carried out by PIRC? 16 By PIRC, yeah. 17 Α. Q. And I think we said before the break that this was 18 19 a meeting that was attended by Keith Harrower and 20 John Ferguson from PIRC? 21 Α. To the family?

No, they were present at the Gold Group meeting.

At the Gold Group, at this meeting, yeah.

- Q. So they were aware of this part --
- 25 A. Yeah.

Q.

Α.

22

- 1 Q. -- of the discussion.
- 2 And there was mention on the previous page, just at
- 3 the bottom, about the family wanting reassurance and not
- 4 wishing anything publicised until they informed the
- 5 deceased's mother, who is in London.
- 6 Do you remember any part of the discussion regarding
- 7 Mr Bayoh's mother who was in London?
- 8 A. Yeah, I can, that I think she'd planned to travel up to
- 9 Scotland the following day or the days after this, but
- it was -- it was coming from Garry McEwan to be honest
- 11 with you. The only aspect of that was that -- that
- I had any input on was that I had spoke to Dave Green
- 13 round about the post-mortem examination, I think I spoke
- 14 about this last week, round about in the absence of any
- formal identification what can -- basically what was the
- fallback options around that, and Dave Green had
- 17 explained to me at that time that there was no
- 18 flexibility with the timing of the post-mortem
- 19 examination the following day due to the availability of
- 20 pathologists.
- 21 Q. I think you did mention that last week.
- 22 A. Yeah, yeah. So that's the only aspect I have on it, but
- I can recall Garry mentioning that the deceased's mother
- resided in London and was travelling up.
- 25 Q. From your memory of that meeting, was there -- what

- 1 impression did you have about the family's perception or
- 2 attitude towards the post-mortem and about a formal
- 3 identification taking place with their involvement?
- 4 A. So my understanding from that forum that I can recall
- 5 was that there were -- there was still resistance from
- 6 the family about attending to identify Mr Bayoh prior to
- 7 the post-mortem actually taking place the following day.
- 8 Q. And when you say resistance, can you help us understand
- 9 what your --
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. -- impression was of the level of that resistance?
- 12 A. It really came from Garry McEwan, to be honest with you,
- and it was really about the fact that they had made it
- 14 clear that they would not attend for the post-mortem
- 15 examination, for the identification aspect.
- Q. We've heard evidence that they wished to give time for
- 17 the deceased's mother, to arrived from London before
- they would formally identify Mr Bayoh prior to the
- 19 post-mortem. Do you have any recollection of that being
- 20 expressed at this Gold Group meeting?
- 21 A. No, as I say, that whole aspect of post-mortem,
- 22 identification, liaison with the family, passed straight
- over to PIRC in respect of any involvement, I had no
- involvement at all after this forum.
- 25 Q. Was there any discussion about clarifying the family's

- 1 position in relation to the post-mortem?
- 2 A. I think there was, and I think that thereafter sat with
- 3 Keith Harrower to make that engagement with the family,
- 4 and that thereafter led to the subsequent phone call and
- 5 visit to the family that evening.
- 6 Q. Again, that was something that you understood PIRC to be
- 7 taking control of?
- 8 A. That was very clear, in respect of that.
- 9 Q. And did you have any other involvement with that matter
- from this meeting?
- 11 A. No, and I think I detailed it in one of my policy logs
- 12 round about the fact that that whole aspect sat with
- 13 PIRC.
- 14 Q. Do you want to look at the policy log and just identify
- 15 -- it may be decision 17. I'm not sure. There's
- mention there of the family and the post-mortem.
- 17 (Pause)
- 18 A. No, that was just about the various aspects that I'd
- 19 discussed with Dave Green around --
- Q. Right.
- 21 A. -- other than -- but I think there was an additional
- 22 entry. Yeah, I think 22 maybe just clarify -- I don't
- 23 know if it will clarify it a bit.
- 24 Q. 22.
- 25 A. Sorry, that's on the 4th, that's on the day after

1 actually, it was just about the FLOs from the PIRC to be 2 deployed to deliver the cause of death to the family. 3 No, I don't think I've detailed it. 4 Q. Do you want to look at your daybook? Maybe you have 5 something in there. 6 (Pause) 7 If we go to page 6, we were talking about the death 8 message note that you'd taken at the end, and then on 9 the right-hand side there's some notes that you've 10 taken. 11 Α. Yeah. 12 Q. And then they go on to the next page, 7. 13 I don't think there is anything at all. Α. 14 Q. Nothing there? 15 Α. No. But in any event that's your recollection now? 16 Q. 17 Yeah. Α. 18 Q. And if we could go back to the minutes, sorry, which are 19 PS06493, I'd like to come on to item, agenda item 12, 20 which is at the bottom of page 3. It's just any other 21 business, and then if we move on to the top of the 22 following page, there are actions listed, and one action 23 is: 24 "Liaise with PIRC re deployment of their FLOs, not deploying FLOs of Police Scotland." 25

1

Α.

Yeah.

2 So was it at this meeting that that decision was taken Q. 3 not to deploy Police Scotland FLOs? 4 Α. It was actually before that, but that was rubber stamped 5 at that forum as such by the gold. Q. We've heard -- you gave evidence last week that officers 6 7 had been recalled to duty --8 Yes. Α. -- and brought to Kirkcaldy to act as FLOs but they were 9 Q. 10 then released from that obligation --A. Correct. 11 12 Q. -- at that stage. 13 Then it says: 14 "A definitive resolution is required re contact with 15 family and reassurance to them." Can you explain what that was? 16 I think it was that discussion round about-- did this 17 Α. now best sit with the PIRC to take on in its entirety 18 around any future liaison with the family. I think it 19 20 kind of explains it a wee bit belower, about the PIRC 21 (inaudible) family and the arrangements. 22 Q. It says: "Chief Superintendent not averse to going back to 23 the house if required to assist in retrieving items for 24 the baby of Collette Bell. Telephone contact to be made 25

- by PIRC re the family and arrangements etc for conveying
 to mortuary."
- 3 A. Yeah.
- 4 Q. So certainly at that Gold Group meeting can you tell us 5 what your understanding was in relation to the family, the purpose for the family being conveyed to the 6 7 mortuary? You'll see where you've noted that 8 previously, on page 3, where at the top of that page --9 this was at the end of item 5 -- there was comment about 10 arrangements on having them, the family, conveyed to the mortuary in Edinburgh, and then that's repeated under, 11 12 "Action", on the final page.
- So again can you explain your understanding of why
 this was being discussed, of the family being conveyed
 to the mortuary?
- Yeah, so that's normal arrangements that we would make 16 Α. 17 for a deceased's family. Rather than trying to get them to explain where the City Mortuary is and where to park 18 and so on and so forth, the family liaison officers 19 20 would normally convey the family or the next of kin to 21 the mortuary and thereafter explain the whole process of identification. So again, that's pretty normal 22 arrangements for any incident as such. 23
- Q. And was the purpose of this for identification?
- 25 A. Yes, it would be, yeah.

25

1 Q. At this Gold Group meeting was it your understanding that the family would have some involvement with 2 identification prior to the post-mortem? 3 4 Α. I think it was intended and it was hoped that they 5 would, but again that thereafter passed in its entirety 6 to Keith Harrower and PIRC to manage that engagement 7 with the family around the post-mortem exam --8 arrangements. Q. So you won't know whether it was explained to the family 9 10 that there was no flexibility in relation to the timing of the post-mortem? 11 12 Α. I wouldn't. No, that would need to come from 13 Keith Harrower. We'd have to hear evidence --14 Q. 15 Α. Yeah. Q. -- from him about that. Thank you. 16 17 I'd like to move on to the next set of minutes for the Gold Group meeting, please, which is 4 May 2015, and 18 minutes that we have for 12.30 the following day. 19 20 I think that's PS03161. You will see these minutes, 21 this is the following day, 12.30, there's no reference 22 there to who was present at that meeting. Do you 23 remember? Hmm. (Pause). I genuinely don't. I think I'd only 24 Α.

slept for about an hour that day into the next day, type

1 thing, so I was unsure exactly who would have been at 2 that. 3 Q. Right, and you were at that anyway. 4 Α. Yes, I was at it, yes. Q. So we see in the factual update, paragraph 3 under the 5 factual update, item agenda 2, move down, the mention of 6 the name DI Stuart Wilson. Who was he? 7 Stuart was in the MIT at that time. 8 Α. So this was in relation to an officer from MIT, not 9 Q. Hardie? 10 No, one of Keith Hardie's team. 11 Α. 12 What did DI Wilson, what was his role? Q. 13 I think Stuart came on in the afternoon of 3 May to Α. 14 offer some assistance with the investigation. 15 Q. So he was part of that team? 16 Α. Yeah. Q. And it says there: 17 "Factual update: 18 "Officers despatched from Kirkcaldy and on arrival 19 20 were faced with deceased to engage them physically, 21 assaulting a female officer and fighting with others." 22 Can you explain what the factual update was at that time? I'm interested in particular in the words: 23 24 "... on arrival were faced with deceased to engage them physically." 25

- 1 Can you explain that?
- 2 A. (Pause). It looks to me as if it's been written, it
- 3 looks very much kind of police talk, descriptions, the
- way it's written, "Deceased to engage them physically",
- 5 it's something that we would put in a police report as
- 6 such. But I don't know who has written the minutes, to
- 7 be honest with you. But I think what it generally means
- is that the officers were call -- were aware of a number
- 9 of calls on that morning to attend Hayfield Road and on
- 10 arrival had been involved in a physical coming together,
- or altercation with the deceased.
- 12 Q. You gave this factual update, did you?
- 13 A. I did, but it looks as if it's a very condensed version
- of what's actually been said.
- 15 Q. I'm interested in whether this minute suggests that the
- deceased was an aggressor?
- 17 A. No.
- Q. Or whether it just simply is talking about there being
- 19 some sort of physical engagement between the officers
- 20 and the --
- 21 A. Yeah. I think all that is is a kind of high level
- 22 synopsis of exactly what I have said, in a kind of more
- 23 detailed update.
- Q. As we move down to item 3 on the agenda, you will see
- 25 this is:

1 "Investigative process - DI Stuart Wilson." And you've explained he was with MIT? 2 3 Α. Yeah. 4 Q. And if we can look at a paragraph: 5 "There are potentially 210 dwellings between Arran Crescent and Hayfield Road locus." 6 7 And you mentioned last week about house-to-house enquiries --8 Yeah. 9 Α. 10 Q. -- being undertaken. Were those house-to-house enquiries being undertaken by Police Scotland officers? 11 12 Α. They were under the instruction of PIRC but supported by 13 Police Scotland so we had the most -- we had the legs on 14 the ground as such, chapping doors. As you say, the 15 house-to-house is basically split into the initial zones, the kind of priority zones that we were looking 16 17 at, at that time, and that early discussion with PIRC was round about that they were looking to note 18 statements from any significant crucial eyewitnesses; if 19 20 we chapped a door and we identified someone they would 21 ask for us to make them aware and they would attend and 22 detail that statement. But the great majority of the 210 houses that had to have their door chapped, that was 23 going to be done by Police Scotland. 24 You talked last week about having 20 or 22 detectives 25 Q.

1 involved with the investigation under your --2 Α. Yeah. -- role. Did that, were there officers within that 3 Q. 4 number who then carried out these house-to-house --So this is 4 May, so this is when we have significant 5 Α. 6 MIT resources now attending at Kirkcaldy to take on the investigation long term. So these were -- as I say, 95% 7 8 of the resources from Police Scotland were MIT resources with the remainder being resources that had carried out 9 10 initial actions the day before but were just completing those actions as I've discussed. 11 12 Q. How many MIT resources came online on 4 May? 13 I'm unsure. Α. Can I ask you about the task that we just see at the 14 Q. 15 bottom, if we can move that up slightly: "TASK -- Advice to be gained from PIRC regarding the 16 17 disclosure of the PM results to the officers involved in 18 the incident. Supervisor to be identified to carry this disclosure out." 19 20 I'm interested in your recollection of this item, 21 this task on the agenda. 22 Yeah, so there was obviously we were moving towards the Α. post-mortem examination that afternoon on $4\ \mathrm{May}$ and 23 I think it was Garry McEwan that had raised the matter 24 round about -- and he raised it to the Chair -- round 25

1 about the disclosure of post-mortem results to the 2 officers involved in the restraint. So there was quite 3 a detailed discussion around that, and PIRC were 4 involved in it to an extent but again, the main 5 representative from PIRC at that time was Keith -sorry, was Billy Little, who was in attendance at the 6 7 City Mortuary for the post-mortem, I believe. 8 So there was -- first of all, there was a discussion 9 round about we would deploy PIRC FLOs to deliver the 10 death message -- sorry, the result of the post-mortem examination to the family, and the second aspect to that 11 12 was round about -- and I think it was, as I say, 13 Garry McEwan, the Chief Super, who had indicated he 14 thought it would have been beneficial in their status as 15 witnesses to provide, for their welfare and wellbeing, a result of the post-mortem examination as well. 16 Right, can I just ask you about this. This meeting took 17 Q. 18 place before the post-mortem had been carried out? 19 Yeah. Α. 20 And you've said there was to deliver the information Q. 21 about the post-mortem to the family, that was going to 22 be done by PIRC; is that right? 23 That was going to be done by PIRC FLOs. Α. PIRC FLOs? 24 Q. 25 Α. Yeah.

- Q. Was there any discussion about when that was to be done?
- 2 A. So that would have been done, my understanding was after
- 3 the post-mortem results were known, which was on the
- 4 evening of 4 May.
- 5 Q. 4 May. But that was under the control of PIRC?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Now, the idea of telling police officers who are
- 8 witnesses the results of the post-mortem, I'm interested
- 9 in how this came around, because, I mean, is this
- something that's normally done, telling witnesses about
- 11 the post-mortem?
- 12 A. Police witnesses or witnesses in general?
- 13 Q. Well, first of all would you normally tell witnesses in
- 14 general?
- 15 A. Erm ... it's not a normal process that I'm aware of,
- that we would normally tell witnesses in general round
- about the result of a post-mortem examination. Family,
- 18 yeah, definitely.
- 19 Q. Is it part of a process if you've got officers involved
- that you would tell them, if they're witnesses?
- 21 A. I'm aware that it has been done before in respect of
- deaths in custody in that respect, just round about the
- 23 whole welfare/wellbeing aspect of it. But these aren't
- 24 normal events.
- 25 Q. Right. So when you say they're not normal events, who

- 1 raised the issue about telling police officers?
- 2 A. So I think that was Garry McEwan, as the divisional
- 3 commander for P Division Fife and looking after the
- 4 welfare of his officers at that time.
- 5 Q. Did he explain at this meeting why he was making this
- 6 suggestion?
- 7 A. No -- I think he did actually, but I can't recall
- 8 exactly his rationale behind it, but I think it was
- 9 around the grounds of their welfare and the fact that
- 10 they were obviously extremely traumatised and concerned
- 11 exactly what had occurred around the restraint of
- 12 Mr Bayoh, and that discussion thereafter took place with
- 13 the Chair, with ACC Nicholson, round about obviously the
- 14 direction or the authority for that would simply sit
- 15 with PIRC and not with Police Scotland because they were
- the lead investigators in respect of that.
- Q. You talked about the hypotheses last week, you've talked
- about keeping an open mind on all of them until you were
- in a position to exclude them, you've not got initial
- 20 personal accounts or operational statements from the
- 21 officers --
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. -- at this stage. What concerns did you have, as SIO,
- 24 about sharing information with the officers about the
- cause of death?

- 1 A. Yeah, so it was mainly what information we would share
- 2 was, I wouldn't say was my concern but I wanted to be
- 3 made aware of what we were actually going to share with
- 4 them.
- 5 Q. Why was that?
- 6 A. As you say, mainly down to the hypotheses that were
- 7 apparent and whether or not there had to be some further
- 8 discussion around whether or not we would disclose that
- 9 once we found out what the results of the post-mortem
- 10 were at that point. So this discussion was based solely
- on welfare and wellbeing of the officers, about
- supporting them in the days and weeks ahead around what
- the result was. But again my thoughts were: okay, let's
- see what the results of the post-mortem are, and
- 15 ultimately that decision lay with PIRC, it did not lie
- with me.
- Q. So you expressed concerns about wanting to know what the
- post-mortem --
- 19 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- results were?
- 21 When you later discovered what the results were, did
- 22 they come -- did PIRC come to you and ask you to be part
- of a further discussion about this matter?
- 24 A. Yeah.
- Q. Tell us about that.

- 1 A. So, and I think I can refer to it in my policy file, but
- 2 they did --
- 3 Q. Do you want to go to that?
- A. Yeah, so I think it's policy decision number 22.
- 5 Q. Tell us what you have written here.
- 6 A. So -- so, sorry, can I take you to decision 20, first of
- 7 all?
- 8 Q. Yes. So decision 20 is page 61469.
- 9 A. So this is the information coming back to me from
- 10 Keith Hardie at the City Mortuary regarding the result
- of the post-mortem examination.
- 12 Q. Right, let's just get this on the screen, decision 20,
- 13 61469, and what does this say here?
- 14 A. "Information from post-mortem examination regarding
- 15 cause of death. Edinburgh City Mortuary. DCI Hardie
- 16 present."
- 17 And I've got in inverted commas basically what Keith
- has informed me:
- "Unascertained pending toxicology."
- 20 Q. When did you get that information --
- 21 A. So I got that round about, I think it was about half
- 22 past 6 on the 4th, I got a phone call, Keith was still
- at the mortuary, the post-mortem had ran for the best
- 24 part of four hours or thereabouts, and he basically
- 25 phoned saying that's it just concluded and here are what

1 we have at this point and that basically he'd asked 2 that -- Billy Little was there at the time as well and 3 Billy had indicated that he was wanting a meeting now at 4 Kirkcaldy Police Office directly after that. 5 Then can we look at the reasoning, please, and what does Q. it say there? 6 7 Yeah, so: Α. 8 "Meeting to be arranged with PIRC at 19.30 hours at 9 Kirkcaldy Police Office to discuss findings and 10 communications back to next of kin and family and also to officers involved in incident." 11 12 Q. Was that the meeting that you mentioned earlier --13 Α. Yes. 14 -- with PIRC? And you were present at that? Q. 15 Α. Yes, I was. And there was a discussion as part of that meeting about 16 Q. 17 whether to share the results with --18 Α. Yes. -- the officers. Tell us about that meeting. 19 Q. 20 So that thereafter if you go to decision 22. Α. 21 Q. Thank you. It says: "Agreement with PIRC --" 22 23 Α. So: 24 "Agreement with PIRC at meeting within Kirkcaldy 25 Police Office with PIRC deputy lead investigator [that's

Billy Little] to progress the following." 1 2 So the two points that came from that meeting: 3 "FLOs to be deployed. PIRC to inform neck next of kin of cause of death." 4 5 And secondly: "An agreed form of words to be developed by SIO and 6 7 PIRC in respect of notification of officers involved in incident." 8 So was that you and someone from PIRC? 9 10 Α. It was myself and Billy Little. Can we find that form of words? 11 Q. 12 Α. Yeah. So that's in the -- that's the next decision. 13 Q. And this was a form of words that was to be shared with 14 the officers? 15 A. And the next of kin. Q. And the next of kin. Can you tell us what we see on 16 17 page -- on, sorry, decision number 23? 18 Α. So: "Agreed form of words from PIRC agreed --" 19 20 So: 21 "Following post-mortem of Sheku Bayoh cause of death has been detailed as unascertained pending toxicology. 22 There is no evidence of any blunt force trauma injury 23 24 which would have been a contributory factor to Mr Bayoh's death." 25

- Q. What does it say under -- we won't read that.

 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. "Reason", and then it says:
- 4 "To ensure no mixed messages to family and others is
- 5 --"
- A. Passed.
- 7 Q. "-- passed to ensure consistency."
- 8 So that was a form of wording agreed for -- to be
- 9 shared with all of the officers --
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. -- who had attended Hayfield Road?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And the next of kin?
- 14 A. Yeah.
- Q. As far as you understood?
- Do you know if PIRC did share that with the next of
- 17 kin?
- 18 A. That action was solely for PIRC to take on.
- 19 Q. Right, and who was going to share that information with
- the officers?
- 21 A. So basically I think I've detailed it. Yeah, I think in
- 22 the next decision so that, the direction for the Chair
- 23 at the Gold Group meeting which we've already discussed
- 24 was that as soon as we were aware of the outcome and the
- 25 results from the post-mortem examination that I would

1 inform ACC Nicholson directly around what that was. ACC Nicholson had spoke to me around the fact that 2 he believed that message would have been -- would be 3 4 better delivered by Chief Superintendent Garry McEwan to 5 the officers because he had personal knowledge of them, I didn't, and that he was -- he was probably better 6 7 placed round about welfare and wellbeing to pass that 8 message to the officers. 9 So again, the aspect to that decision is that 10 Chief Superintendent briefed -- so I phoned Garry McEwan on the -- after speaking to Mr Nicholson saying, "This 11 12 is the cause of death are you quite happy for this?" 13 And I read out verbatim the information we were going to 14 pass to the officers, and ACC Nicholson endorsed that 15 and asked me to contact Garry McEwan and pass that 16 information to him at that time, and I think I can 17 recall Garry actually was writing it down as I was 18 speaking to him on the phone around what exactly he was 19 going to say so there would be no mixed messages around 20 that. 21 Q. Do you know who actually delivered the --22 I think it was Garry. Α. Himself? 23 Q. To all the officers, yes. 24 Α. Q. To all the officers? 25

- 1 A. Yeah, yeah.
- 2 Q. Do you know how he did that?
- 3 A. So, Garry had said to me that he was going to come into
- 4 Kirkcaldy Police Office to do it. Now, I don't know
- 5 whether that was to do with the privacy and he would be
- 6 able to make phone calls privately within
- 7 Kirkcaldy Office but he was at home at that time, so
- I took it he was coming in to make the phone calls from
- 9 Kirkcaldy Office and it was going to be done via
- 10 telephone and not in person. But again, I may be wrong
- 11 with that.
- 12 Q. Do you know when that --
- 13 A. That happened later that evening.
- Q. That evening, 4 May?
- 15 A. Yeah, yeah. Yeah, yeah.
- Q. So it had been -- the suggestion had been raised by
- McEwan, the wording was drafted and noted in your policy
- 18 file by you, and Keith Harrower from PIRC?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. That was then approved by --
- 21 A. No, sorry, Billy Little.
- 22 Q. Oh, sorry. It was approved by Billy Little from PIRC?
- A. Yeah, yeah.
- Q. Approved by ACC Nicholson?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And then essentially delivered to McEwan to roll out to
- 2 all of the officers --
- 3 A. Correct.
- 4 Q. -- who had attended Hayfield Road?
- 5 You've mentioned the welfare issue. We've heard
- 6 that -- we've heard from Conrad Trickett that he was
- 7 post-incident manager and he was required in his role to
- 8 balance the welfare of the officers with the
- 9 facilitating the investigative needs of the
- 10 investigation. Why was Conrad Trickett not involved in
- any of these discussions?
- 12 A. One, he wasn't part of the Gold Group. Two, the role of
- 13 PIM wasn't as ... we weren't aware of the whole aspect
- of what the PIM brought to post-incident procedures and
- to an investigation, so again it wasn't widely known
- what his role was, in respect of that, and not having
- 17 him at the Gold Group he didn't have the ability to
- provide that input round about, "This is what I should
- do in respect of that". So again --
- 20 Q. I think last week you gave evidence that you thought
- 21 with hindsight it would have been of benefit to have him
- 22 within the Gold Group?
- A. Absolutely, yeah.
- 24 Q. Do you think in relation to this discussion that there
- 25 would have been benefit in having input from

- 1 Conrad Trickett as PIM?
- 2 A. Yeah, but ultimately that decision lay with the gold
- 3 commander, ACC Nicholson, to -- who he deemed to be more
- 4 appropriate to deliver that message, so again I could
- 5 see his rationale behind doing that and not coming from
- 6 Conrad.
- 7 Q. Was it only ACC Nicholson's decision as to who should
- 8 deliver it or was it also his ultimate decision whether
- 9 it should, in fact, be delivered?
- 10 A. Ultimately, yes.
- 11 Q. And as SIO, did you have any lingering concerns about
- 12 providing information to police officers who had been at
- 13 Hayfield Road in relation to the cause of death prior to
- 14 actually having initial personal accounts or operational
- 15 statements from them?
- 16 A. So, ideally I would have preferred to be in the position
- of having the personal initial accounts or operational
- 18 statements, but I wasn't -- I knew for a fact that that
- obviously wasn't going to happen. So my perception of
- 20 the cause of death was -- it was very vague in respect
- of that wording which is within that. It's a pretty
- 22 general result that comes from a number of post-mortem
- 23 examinations where further analysis is required
- regarding the cause of death around that.
- 25 So it was relatively brief and it really didn't say

- 1 very much, to be honest with you, you know what I mean, it was obviously pending toxicology and pending further 2 3 information at that time. So, balancing the welfare, 4 did it impact on my investigation or the PIRC 5 investigation? Ultimately it wasn't my decision to simply decide that at that time but Billy Little was 6 7 happy for it to go out to the officers concerned and 8 ultimately the decision lay with Billy. So, was the decision ultimately Billy Little's or was 9 Q. 10 the decision ultimately ACC Nicholson's? 11 So the decision to allow the message to go to the Α. 12 officers sat with Billy Little. The decision about who 13 would deliver the message sat with ACC Nicholson, and 14 thereafter he instructed me to deliver the message to 15 Garry McEwan to deliver to the officers. So the decision to share information about cause of 16 Q. death with the attending officers --17 Α. Yes.
- 18
- 19 -- rested with Billy Little? Q.
- Yeah, and that's detailed in the policy file on the 20 Α. 21 discussion I had with Billy Little at that time.
- 22 We may have heard that -- the suggestion that without Q. information about the cause of death from the 23 post-mortem, officers would be unwilling to give any 24 25 sort of statement. Was that part of the discussion that

12

13

14

- 1 you had either at the Gold Group meeting or the meeting with PIRC at 7.30 in the evening? 2
- There was some reference to it, I think it came from 3 Α. 4 Chief Inspector Shepherd or potentially Garry McEwan, 5 I'm not sure, that there was information about the fact that officers were not going to provide a statement 6 7 until the result of the post-mortem examination, so that 8 there was information there, it hadn't came directly to 9 me, but it was discussed at the Gold Group and it was 10 perhaps an extension of what I already knew, they weren't willing to provide statements. 11
 - Q. What influence did that have on you as SIO? You've explained last week that there was a gap and you wanted to get statements.
- 15 Yeah. It would have been extremely beneficial if that Α. 16 was the case, that they would have provided operational 17 statements directly after that, which we know now wasn't the case. However, did it impact as SIO and did it 18 19 impact from a PIRC perspective on the information we've 20 provided the officers? I thought the information we gave them was extremely vague around the result of the 22 post-mortem examination and, as I say, I think that the 23 legal advice they supplementally got was to delay any statement at all until after toxicology comes back and 24 25 that there was thereafter a delay of 30 days or so

1 because of that.

- Q. In relation to the wording of the cause of death we looked at a moment ago, there was specific reference to blunt force trauma and that not having been part of the --
- 6 A. Yeah.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- cause of death. What were the particular reasons for noting blunt force trauma?
- A. So that all came from the information that I was given

 from Keith Hardie, who was at the post-mortem

 examination. So again, it was, as I say, very vague

 information at that time, but again, it was -- the cause

 of death was unascertained at that time, so again we

 were not eliminating any potential hypothesis at that

 stage.
 - Q. We've heard about PC Tomlinson and his concerns when he returned to Kirkcaldy Police Office on the morning that he'd struck Mr Bayoh on the head on a number of occasions with his baton, and we've heard other evidence that striking someone with a baton to the head is a red zone, I think it was called, or a red area that can cause death. Was there any part of the discussion or the rationale or the thinking to provide some sort of reassurance to PC Tomlinson that he had not caused death as a result of striking Mr Bayoh to the head with

1 a baton?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 2 Yeah, so I didn't have that information round about Α. 3 Tomlinson, so the information we passed to the officers 4 was a form of words which was agreed between PIRC and 5 myself but ultimately PIRC signed off on it, and, as 6 I say, for me it was relatively vague round about what 7 information we were passing to the officers. The information you've explained to me I wasn't aware of, 8 and that obviously came subsequently during the noting 9 10 of more extensive statements and accounts. But at that stage, as I said before, and I've consistently said, the 11 12 gap was the fact that I didn't have that information 13 which would have gave me that -- allowed me to fill the gap from an investigative perspective. 14
 - Q. So, even though we've heard evidence from PC Tomlinson that he came back and he spoke to officers in Kirkcaldy Police Office, in particular I think Austin Barrett, that wasn't information that was available to you on 3 May?
 - A. No, there was no information at all coming to me from the officers or from the Federation -- Austin Barrett obviously was a Federation member, but I never met Austin Barrett on the day, it was Amanda Givan, but as I've already gave evidence, Amanda Givan's direction was that they would not be providing statements.

Q. Reflecting now on that decision to share the information with officers, it may be said that there is a perception on the part of the family or the public more widely, and concern, that people who were witnesses but where they had not given initial accounts or operational statements were being shared information about cause of death, and concern that that might influence in some way their own account which they'd not yet given.

Can you understand that that decision could give rise to concern in public perception, in perception with the family?

A. Yeah.

- Q. And how would that impact on your role as SIO?
- A. So the information we gave, when we gave the officers that information, they were witnesses, their status did not change at all through the course of my involvement with them, there was no reasonable cause to suspect that they had been involved in any criminality or any misconduct. From the information -- and the very vague information we had was that force had been reasonable, but again there was huge amount of gaps within what had actually happened round about force but there was nothing to indicate excessive force that we could pick up at that particular stage, so their status was that of witnesses.

open.

25

1 So again, back to welfare, wellbeing, support of the officers was that we would provide them -- and again, 2 there was quite a detailed, as I say, with Garry McEwan 3 4 with the Chair, with a number of other members, round 5 about the rationale of providing this information to them, but it was simply based on their welfare and 6 7 wellbeing. Were you ever in a position -- you've described your 8 Q. 9 involvement as SIO. Yes. 10 Α. Were you ever in a position to exclude the hypothesis 11 Q. 12 that excessive force had been used on Mr Bayoh? 13 Not when I -- no. Α. Or that it had been used on him because he was black? 14 Q. 15 So I think that's two questions there, two separate Α. 16 questions. I haven't finished my first question, that's why I was 17 Q. 18 asking. So was there ever a position when -- a point at 19 which you were involved as SIO where you were able to 20 exclude the possibility and the hypothesis that 21 excessive force had been used? 22 Let's leave that at one question. 23 No, there was not, no. When I had done a handover to Keith Hardie, to the MIT, that hypothesis still remained 24

- 1 Q. And was there ever a point in time when you were
- 2 involved as SIO that you could exclude the possibility
- 3 that the actions of the officers had been influenced by
- 4 the fact that Mr Bayoh was black?
- 5 A. At no times, at no time at all.
- 6 Q. So those hypotheses could not be excluded as
- 7 possibilities by you?
- 8 A. So the hypothesis round about the attack or the
- 9 restraint happened on him because he was black was not
- one of the hypotheses I've already mentioned to you.
- 11 Q. Well, why not?
- 12 A. Because the aspect of the information I had at the
- particular time did not indicate in any way that it was
- 14 racially motivated.
- Q. Was that not something that you considered because you
- were keeping an open mind?
- 17 A. Absolutely, but the aspect that I had at that time round
- about the hypotheses that I was running with, with the
- 19 circumstances of Mr Bayoh being in the street with
- 20 a knife, this was not some unprovoked attacked or
- 21 restraint by police officers at the stage, with the
- 22 information I had.
- 23 Q. But if you were keeping an open mind, you were aware
- that Mr Bayoh was black?
- A. Absolutely.

- 1 Q. And you've talked last week about the fact that there
- were a number of Inquiries down south --
- 3 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- and we'll come on to that later today, but why was it
- 5 not part of your working hypotheses about excessive
- force being used?
- 7 A. So excessive force being used was a hypothesis which
- I have already described, yes.
- 9 Q. And was it not part of any hypothesis that the reason
- 10 for excessive force being used could have been because
- 11 Mr Bayoh was black?
- 12 A. There was nothing which I had in respect of the
- information or evidence, and we have independent
- 14 witnesses from the public that have called about
- Mr Bayoh being in the street with a knife, acting
- 16 erratically. The restraint came as a result of
- Mr Bayoh's behaviour, that did not in any way -- there
- was no relevance at all, the fact he was black, in
- 19 respect to that. The restraint occurred because of his
- 20 activity and because of his behaviour.
- 21 Q. But he had died at the scene, and you've said the
- post-mortem was unascertained.
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. When I say the post-mortem, I mean cause of death was
- 25 unascertained. So were you closing your mind to the

7

8

9

10

11

25

- possibility that the fact he was black had something to do with the circumstances?
- A. No, and I've already said that one of the hypotheses

 which remained open was excessive force had been used,

 and, as I say, that was still apparent and still evident

 until I actually handed over the investigation.
 - Q. Before I move on to other questions about this, can
 I ask you briefly about completion of paperwork. We've
 talked last week and today about statements. Can you
 explain the obligations on officers to complete use of
 spray forms in May 2015?
- 12 Α. I genuinely can't. In my role, even back then, it's 13 nothing I would have actually had kind of hands-on experience of doing. I'm aware there were online forums 14 15 or electronic forms that they had to complete, but regarding how you complete them and where you submit 16 17 them through to, I think it's to the Officer Safety 18 Training Unit, or wherever else it goes to. But in my role in 2015 there was nothing I really actually got 19 20 involved in was the completion of use of spray forms, 21 that would have been their line manager that would have 22 basically ensured that the various processes were 23 carried out around that, but nothing as SIO I would have been involved in. 24
 - Q. What about use of force forms?

- 1 A. Similar, I mean, that's the personal responsibility of
- 2 the officers or their line managers to complete.
- 3 Q. In the absence of getting initial personal accounts or
- 4 operational statements, would these forms not have
- 5 provided some assistance to you as SIO?
- 6 A. Absolutely.
- 7 Q. And did you consider at any stage whether you could --
- 8 you had some leverage in terms of requiring the officers
- 9 to complete these forms prior to going off duty?
- 10 A. It was clear from my discussion with Amanda Givan that
- 11 there was -- they were not going to complete notebooks,
- forms or provide operational statements prior to legal
- 13 advice.
- 14 Q. And so you classed the use of spray forms and the use of
- force forms as part of that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. And did you consider whether any further steps could be
- taken by you as SIO in relation to these forms?
- 19 A. Erm, not at that time, not on 3 or 4 May, that was
- 20 obviously something that was going to come through the
- 21 subsequent investigation, but, as I say, on 3 May,
- 22 extremely fast-moving, it was clear that the advice from
- 23 the Federation was not to provide any further
- 24 information at this stage until seeking legal advice.
- 25 Q. And we've heard that although that can be the advice, it

is still an option for officers to --

1

2 Α. Yeah. -- give statements or to complete forms or to give 3 Q. 4 information, even if the legal advice is not to do that. 5 At any time did you consider asking the officers individually if they would be prepared to give initial 6 7 personal accounts or statements or complete any of the forms? 8 Yes, so that sits with the PIM, because PIP's been 9 10 initiated, so again that sits with Conrad. And did you ask Conrad Trickett to facilitate obtaining 11 Q. 12 use of spray or use of force forms. Not in particular, but I did ask around personal initial 13 Α. account/operational statements, as I've just --14 15 Q. Yes, you gave evidence about that. 16 So was there anything done by you in relation to seeking the forms to be completed? 17 18 No, I mean, it was discussed but the position of the Α. 19 officers was so clear that they were not going to be 20 providing any statements, documentation at all. I take 21 your point round about: well, is there anything more we 22 can do to almost ask or direct them that they have to do it? You know what I mean, it's a really difficult one: 23 how do you actually force someone to give a statement or 24 give a personal initial account when their position is 25

1 they are basically not doing anything at all until they seek further legal advice around this at this stage? 2 3 The SOP states that obviously officers should 4 account for their accounts and their movements whilst on 5 any tour of duty or whilst engaged with ... but again, how do you physically do that without their consent to 6 provide that information to you? You know what I mean, 7 8 it's extremely difficult, you know what I mean, you can 9 ask them, you can prompt them to do it, thereafter if 10 they don't you revert back to performance regulations and misconduct or whatever else. But at that stage of 11 12 a critical investigation, what can you actually 13 physically do? Q. Did you consider the possibility of using misconduct or 14 15 disciplinary proceedings as some sort of lever to encourage the completion of the forms? 16 No. No, no. But it was in the back of my mind because 17 Α. 18 I was aware obviously that officers have a duty to 19 provide information to an SIO as such in respect of that 20 and I think it was the investigation of death SOP at the 21 time, they should make you aware of the circumstances of 22 the death. 23 But again, standard operating procedures are there as how it should work, but again sometimes there are 24 occasions such as this whereby you're left with 25

a significant incident whereby the advice and the legal
advice they are getting, even before I arrived -they've got a Federation rep there before I arrived
providing that direction, Amanda (inaudible) she did do
that.

But it was clear from my engagement and through the course of that whole day of 3 May that there was -- it was extremely unlikely that they were going to submit anything at all, and, as I say, that progressed through the 3rd and into the 4th and on the 4th it became the indication was that they would potentially submit after the post-mortem examination, but with the post-mortem examination being extremely vague in its findings it thereafter brought in the whole aspect of the toxicology which takes a period of time.

- Q. What could you have done if you'd wanted to raise the spectre of disciplinary or misconduct proceedings; what could you have done in your role as SIO?
- A. So there's a number of things, but that probably sits more with their line management round about the fact that they failed to do that. So there is that whole line management aspect starting from the sergeant to their inspector. So round about the aspect that Stevie Kay has the role of the governance of that shift as such, of the officers involved.

```
1
                 And regarding my own perspective of it is that if
 2
             the legal advice is not to provide anything at all, as
 3
             I say, other than -- I'm not -- I'm unsure, I mean do we
 4
             put down or do you actually move towards misconduct at
 5
             such an early stage on the back that the Federation
             advice is not to provide anything at that stage? So
 6
 7
             again, it was trying to kind of balance this through.
 8
             It was extremely unusual, as I said, 27 years I've never
             had the refusal of operational statements, but I'm still
 9
10
             a bit puzzled how you force someone to give a statement,
             and I think that's the challenge I had.
11
12
         MS GRAHAME: Thank you.
13
                 I'm conscious of the time.
         LORD BRACADALE: We'll stop for lunch and sit at 2 o'clock.
14
15
         (1.02 pm)
16
                            (The short adjournment)
         (2.04 pm)
17
18
         LORD BRACADALE: Detective Chief Superintendent, could you
             help me clarify a couple of things, please.
19
20
                 Could we have on the screen the minute of the
21
             Gold Group meeting on 4 May, that's PS03161, isn't it?
22
             Can you help me to understand how the minute of the
23
             meeting is produced?
         A. Yeah, so it will be an identified minute taker which the
24
25
             Chair or a member of -- either the gold or silver
```

1 commander will identify. That individual is obviously 2 within the room whilst the meeting commences, and in the 3 great majority of Gold Groups there are a kind of running parallel action log which thereafter moves from 4 5 meeting to meeting in respect of that. The individual usually who takes the minutes is probably not actively 6 7 involved in the investigation, it's usually someone 8 independent from that who's brought in just simply for 9 that kind of bureaucratic process. They will condense 10 what's been said into a synopsis of what they deem to be the basis of what is being communicated by the 11 12 individual who makes that input. 13 The important aspect of the Gold Group minutes is 14 that at the conclusion and when they're drafted they 15 should be sent back to the gold commander to have final sign-off. So ultimately ACC Nicholson should have 16 17 signed off on all the Gold Group minutes that have been progressed over the two days, 3rd and 4 May, and as 18 I say, only after the sign-off by ACC Nicholson will 19 20 they thereafter be published. LORD BRACADALE: So if there are different editions of these 21 minutes, should I understand that a final version will 22 be approved by the Chair? 23 That's the way it should work, sir. 24 Α. LORD BRACADALE: Now, was there anyone from PIRC at this 25

1 meeting? 2 I'm sure there were, on the 4th, yeah. I don't think --LORD BRACADALE: Who was that? 3 I don't think it was Billy Little, however, I think he 4 Α. 5 was at the post-mortem examination, but I'm not sure who it was, but I know for a fact there were PIRC 6 7 representatives at the investigative briefing I gave at 8 10 o'clock that morning on the 4th. So I think we've 9 already looked at the minutes of that meeting, sir, so 10 there were PIRC representatives at that meeting that had came online on the 4th, that came to that forum, but in 11 12 the absence of membership of that Gold Group I can't 13 actually say who was at it, but I would imagine 14 certainly there would have been some representatives 15 from PIRC at it. LORD BRACADALE: On another matter, were you aware as to 16 17 whether there were written terms of reference for PIRC provided by the Crown Office on 3 May? 18 19 A. No, but I was aware it was getting drafted, so I'd spoke 20 to Keith Harrower, the DCI, on the 3rd and he says that 21 there were definitive terms of reference getting drafted by Crown Office for PIRC, but I did not have sight of 22 23 them. LORD BRACADALE: Did you ever have sight of them? 24 No, I didn't. 25

- 1 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you.
- 2 Ms Grahame.
- 3 MS GRAHAME: Thank you.
- 4 Perhaps if possible could we go back to, I think
- 5 it's PS784, we talked about this, I think this is the
- 6 briefing note that you've just --
- 7 A. Yeah.
- 8 Q. -- referred to. We've not discussed them today, but
- 9 they were previously part of your evidence. So there
- 10 they are. Do you remember looking -- is this the
- briefing notes you're referring to?
- 12 A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. This is a briefing note from 10 o'clock in the morning
- on 4 May and we did note previously you have had chaired
- this briefing?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. And that PIRC had asked for all original manuscript
- statements to be given to them, along with typed copies.
- 19 Was that a request made at the meeting by someone from
- 20 PIRC, or was it something that you raised at the
- 21 meeting?
- 22 A. I believe I'd raised that at the meeting.
- Q. Right.
- A. On the knowledge that that's what PIRC were looking for.
- 25 Q. And I think you gave evidence last week that that was --

1 I put to you that that would include officers? 2 Α. Yes. But would it also include other original manuscript 3 Q. 4 statements from witnesses that you'd obtained? 5 Α. Yeah. Then it mentions further down that: 6 Q. 7 "The PIRC lead is Billy Little." 8 Do you see the name of anyone there from PIRC? No, but I don't think Billy was at that meeting, as 9 Α. 10 I say, I think he was at the post-mortem, I think the post-mortem was due to start at 2 o'clock, I believe. 11 12 Q. If we could maybe look through that first page and then 13 on to the second page, do you see any other references 14 to anyone from PIRC there that might help? 15 (Pause) 16 If we stop there. 17 (Pause) 18 Do you want to see that again? 19 No, I'm just reading through it just now. No, I don't Α. 20 see anyone. It's difficult, there's no membership of 21 that group at all, but my understanding at that time there were members from PIRC there but I can't actually 22 recall who was there as such, but ... 23 Q. But that's your recollection anyway now, that there were 24 25 people from PIRC here?

1 Α. No. 2 Would there be any reason not to have people from PIRC Q. 3 there on 4 May? 4 Α. Absolutely not, no, that was obviously the second day 5 and they were beginning to move very quickly, some of their actions and activity around it, so we would -- we 6 7 would have required PIRC there. 8 Q. I think you've said a number of times PIRC first came to 9 a Gold Group meeting at the 2.40, the 14.40? 10 Α. Yeah. Once they'd arrived and become part of that Gold Group 11 Q. 12 structure, did they continue to attend those Gold Group 13 meetings? Yes, that's correct. 14 Α. 15 Q. Could I ask you to look at a statement from Lesley Boal, please, and this is SBPI 00223. We've not yet heard 16 17 evidence from Lesley Boal. This is a statement that DCS Lesley Boal gave on 23 September and 4 November last 18 19 year. It's been signed and I'd like to look at 20 paragraph 121, please: 21 "Ch Supt McEwan and I didn't discuss the nature of 22 the investigation. Race as a possibility was not discussed with Ch Supt McEwan. However, it is in the 23 24 back of your mind when you're thinking about all 25 possibilities. In terms of hypotheses, one would have

25

1 been that the male had been treated differently because he was a black male. I can't remember having 2 3 a conversation with anybody else about it, but the 4 feeling I got was that everybody was thinking along the 5 same lines as me that it was a possibility that the 6 actions of the police officers or a police officer was 7 because Mr Bayoh was black." 8 I wonder if, looking at that, do you have any 9 comments about whether this was something that you had 10 in your mind? I think it was a wider aspect of the impact that we had 11 Α. 12 the death of a black male within Kirkcaldy after police 13 contact. It was, as I said prior to the break, we had 14 the circumstances of the incident and the fact that 15 restraint had been made and officers responded to a spontaneous incident involving Mr Bayoh. The 16 17 community impact, the media impact, the climate within the UK at that time in 2015, as I said, the previous 18 incidents we had, down south in particular, where about 19 20 the death of individual black males in particular 21 following restraint was, I mean, was paramount, I mean, 22 it was significant and I've already gave evidence around 23 that. The hypothesis round about restraint and the aspect of Mr Bayoh being black, there was nothing to 24

indicate that that was a motivation for the officers

- that I could see at that particular time, but it was
 something I was aware of.
- Q. So did that possibility remain open until at least you could get the statements and accounts of the officers?
 - A. Yeah, and that linked into the whole aspect of restraint being one of the hypotheses and round about the motivation and what would thereafter subsequently come from that, from once we got the personal accounts off the officers involved.
 - Q. So when you were considering the hypothesis of restraint having contributed to his death and you were considering the information that you were aware of regarding particular matters about the -- as DCS Lesley Boal says here, that the male had been treated differently because he was a black male; that was one of the hypotheses, was it?
 - A. So that's Lesley's hypothesis, that's one of the things that she's saying that she hasn't shared with anyone around that, as she quite rightly points out, but again I was keeping a very open and transparent approach to this. Was this a particular option that was going to develop as we got personal initial accounts, that there was some aspect that it was racially motivated, so it fitted in with the aspect of the hypothesis round about restraint being used, excessive force potentially being

25

used: what was the motivation around excessive force 1 being used if it was excessive force? So it was, it was 2 3 obviously, it was a significant aspect of the response 4 to the investigation. So the restraint and the possibility of excessive force 5 Q. 6 having been used by the police officers at Hayfield Road 7 was one of the hypotheses? 8 It was. Α. And in keeping an open mind it was a possibility which 9 Q. 10 you were bearing in mind that race was a factor, the 11 fact that Mr Bayoh was black was a factor in that, in 12 assessing that hypothesis? 13 Absolutely, there was nothing discounted at that Α. 14 particular stage. 15 Q. So that remained a part of the hypotheses and part of the investigation until it could be excluded? 16 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. And it couldn't really be excluded until you had initial 19 accounts or operational statements from the officers? 20 Correct, and the wider aspect of the investigation as Α. 21 well, house-to-house, CCTV review, and so on and so forth. 22 23 Q. Thank you. 24 You've mentioned -- if we could go to your own

Inquiry statement, please, you've mentioned in

1 paragraph 47, and you've mentioned just a moment ago, 2 other Inquiries that you were aware of in relation to 3 deaths -- here we are -- of black men following on 4 police contact. 5 I'll just read out this paragraph: "For experiences arising from significant 6 7 incidents -- such as the Stephen Lawrence, Habib Ulla, 8 Sean Rigg and Christopher Alder cases -- as well as 9 other incidents that were relevant to equality, 10 diversity and race, there were significant inputs into the equality and diversity and OST courses over the 11 12 years, in terms of identifying potential shortcomings 13 and good practice. None of these courses 'stood still', 14 they were constantly evolving. My impression is that 15 the findings from the various inquiries and reviews are still filtering through into law enforcement. 16 17 For example, the findings of institutional racism 18 following the MacPherson Public Inquiry, led to significant internal review across all UK law 19 20 enforcement agencies." 21 I'm interested in a number of things that you've 22 mentioned in this paragraph. We will no doubt hear more evidence in the future about these matters, but since 23 you've raised them here. We know, and a number of 24 25 officers have given evidence about the Stephen Lawrence

1 Inquiry, which was the MacPherson report, MacPherson Public Inquiry, that there was a finding of 2 3 institutional racism in relevance to 4 the Metropolitan Police investigation into the murder of 5 Stephen Lawrence. That was published in 1999. And again, we'll hear more information about 6 7 Christopher Alder, but we understand that he had been 8 unlawfully killed in 2000. Sean Rigg died following 9 unsuitable and unnecessary force from officers, 10 including a prone restraint in 2012. The conclusion of the inquest jury into the death of Habib Ulla was in 11 12 2015. 13 Would you agree that those Inquiries and those cases 14 involved concerns about the use of force by police 15 officers, and in particular there was concern about the treatment of black men in police custody, or after 16 17 police contact, due to their race? 18 Α. Yes. Q. And that some of those concerns that were raised in 19 20 these Inquiries demonstrate that there are, there may be 21 different considerations for black people rather than 22 white people? 23 Erm ... Α. 24 (Pause). 25 So, again, I think you have assessment of -- my

- understanding of the cases are pretty -- is pretty

 accurate around that, about the aspect of their arrest,

 they're in custody, and about their treatment and

 excessive force being used. Sorry, can you just repeat

 what the final question was on that?
- Q. Let's just look at this generally, then. You seem -you've named these Inquiries specifically --
- 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 Q. -- and you've obviously got a working knowledge of these
 10 matters. Tell us what you know about ...
- 11 I probably would be doing them a disservice to try to Α. 12 explain each and every one of them, but I mean my 13 synopsis was that, the Lawrence one aside, the three 14 which I've mentioned there, I think there was one 15 whereby there was apparent mental health issues with one of the individuals concerned, he attended hospital, and 16 17 thereafter -- he was a previous victim of an assault and thereafter conveyed to -- restrained and conveyed to 18 19 custody and died within the cell passageway. And again, 20 it's clear that there wasn't an appreciation of the 21 background to some of the individuals involved in these sort of critical incidents, that there should be 22 a greater understanding of mental health, how we treat 23 24 individuals when we come into contact with them, and 25 again, back into the whole aspect of restraint and what

1 is appropriate in the circumstances. So --2 And what did you take personally from your understanding Q. 3 of these Inquiries in relation to the factor that there 4 were concerns that these cases involved black men? 5 Yeah, I mean, my conclusion with them was that there was Α. significant shortcomings on behalf of the police in 6 7 respect of the management of each of these incidents 8 involving black males. So can you give us a little more information about your 9 Q. 10 understanding of what those concerns were? Erm, so, as I said, I think -- I mean, it was to do with 11 Α. 12 the level of restraint utilised in one or two of the 13 incidents, it was to do with the lack of appreciation of 14 underlying mental health issues with one or two of them 15 as well, round about the -- is custody the correct place for these individuals who are going through such 16 17 a traumatic event? 18 So again, I can't recall in detail, as you would 19 appreciate, the ins and outs of every one of the cases, 20 but the outcome for me was that there had been 21 shortcomings and failings on behalf of the police in 22 respect of how we had responded, how we managed, how we dealt with such incidents. And again, I mentioned that 23 it was brought up on some of the OST courses, so some of 24 the officer safety training courses you went on after 25

- 1 that, they would perhaps refer to one of the cases round
- 2 about an incident or a case down south or the findings
- 3 from an incident down south whereby positional asphyxia
- 4 or whatever was basically identified and the
- 5 shortcomings were this or that in that respect.
- 6 So --
- 7 Q. Had you had training from Police Scotland in relation to
- 8 these cases?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Is that how you knew the names?
- 11 A. No, no. Basically I'd done research myself. I was
- aware of the cases that were kind of running down south,
- and some of the findings of them, but I think what they
- 14 did do for the OST, they didn't go into any detail that
- I can recall -- they maybe did name them but I can't
- recall them back to that time in the OST. But they
- 17 would give you an understanding of -- such as a stated
- 18 case or such as an incident whereby the findings
- 19 thereafter led to a change in process or a change in
- 20 procedure, that we no longer basically put someone face
- 21 down in a cell van, for example, while conveying them to
- 22 custody. So it was more about the learning and the
- 23 shortcomings that had been identified and thereafter how
- 24 we were moving towards best practice as such.
- 25 Q. When did you do this research? Was it before preparing

1 your statement? 2 So, no, that was after 2015, after I was involved in the Α. 3 incident within Kirkcaldy. 4 Q. So were you -- you've not really mentioned much about 5 the concerns arising from these cases or Inquiries in relation to the fact that the men were black or concerns 6 7 about the way the police treated people because they 8 were black. What did you take from these Inquiries in relation to that? 9 10 A. As I say, I didn't go into them in any detail, I didn't study the cases individually, you know what I mean, 11 12 I was just looking at what were the outcomes, what were 13 the findings from some of the independent reviews that 14 were done around it as such and just to take any 15 learning I could from it. But not necessarily learning in relation to the factor 16 Q. of race? 17 18 A. Yeah, if there was race -- if there was finding in 19 respect of race, I would have took that as well. But, 20 as I say, I can't recall in detail the three cases that 21 I've detailed there. 22 Q. All right. You've commented on the Inquiries. Can you help us 23 understand how you reconcile your understanding of these 24 25 Inquiries and the learning that you've taken from those

- 1 when you've also said in your Inquiry statement that
- 2 race had:
- "... no basis for considering race as a factor in
 the circumstances at Hayfield Road."
- A. So that was to do with my decision-making, that race didn't impact on how I responded to that incident as
- 7 an SIO.
- 8 Q. Right.
- There was obviously a wider understanding and 9 Α. 10 appreciation that race was going to be significant in respect of this incident, but I think what I've 11 12 mentioned in my statement was that in respect of being 13 open, being transparent in my decision-making and my 14 direction round about where the priorities lie was 15 pretty standard for any investigation I've managed in respect of an unexplained death. 16
- Q. So in identifying your priorities and your actions, race wasn't a factor in identifying those?
- A. They are standard priorities that you would deal with for any unexplained death, no matter regarding any ethnicity.
- Q. And if there are wider implications in relation to black
 men, for example, are there any standard priority
 actions where you automatically include race as
 something to be prioritised and considered?

1 Α. Yeah, and that's why we had the Gold Group structure. So again, the whole aspect of it had been deemed 2 3 a critical incident because of the death of Mr Bayoh. 4 Also the fact is that the wider aspect of Mr Bayoh being 5 black was discussed at the Gold Group and the wider aspect of the community impact, the media coverage, the 6 7 public perception. That's why we had that whole 8 Gold Group governance in place. As I say, the pillar 9 I was dealing with was the investigation and I was 10 taking anything from the Gold Group which may cross over in respect of his race or ethnicity. 11 12 Q. Despite that discussion in the Gold Group, there was 13 nothing said there that actually altered your priority 14 actions in terms of the investigation? 15 So there was a wider appreciation of what we were Α. dealing with, and the community impact and the public 16 17 perception around it. So there were challenges with it, because of that. 18 19 So in answer to your question, yeah, it did impact 20 on my priorities, it did impact on my approach to the 21 investigation in respect of Mr Bayoh being black, but it 22 was a wider consideration, not just for the investigation but for the complete Gold Group and the 23 Police Scotland response to his death. 24 So you were SIO in relation to the investigation. 25 Q.

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. What impact did those wider considerations have in
- 3 relation to you, your role and your investigation?
- 4 A. So that impacted very much on the FLO strategy which we
- 5 began to develop, although it didn't actually move to
- 6 Police Scotland deployment, but ethnicity, his
- 7 nationality, his religion, so again it was that wider
- 8 appreciation of exactly how we could support the family
- 9 in respect of some of those areas moving forward.
- 10 Q. Insofar as we're focusing only on the investigation of
- 11 the events into Sheku Bayoh's death --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- not the family liaison, what impact did race have on
- 14 the actions you took in investigating the death of
- 15 Sheku Bayoh?
- 16 A. So that was just keeping an open mind at all times
- around it, the hypotheses that may very much well
- develop over that, it was about putting in place the
- 19 significant stepping stones, I mean, the base layer to
- 20 allow us to basically move forward with the
- 21 investigation, that we'd not missed anything at all as
- 22 the days and weeks would progress, so my aspect was
- 23 response, putting in place a framework for the
- 24 investigation, with the knowledge that it was going very
- 25 quickly over to PIRC and to the Major Investigation

Teams, but taking cognisance of all the areas I've

identified as priority as well as the aspect of race and

whether or not there was some racially motivated aspect

to that which may come online once we get personal

initial accounts or when the further investigation

develops.

- Q. So when you've given evidence that there was nothing that you were able to identify that indicated race had been a factor in those early days of the investigation, and you're also saying, "I'm keeping an open mind", can you reconcile those two things for us?
- A. Yeah, absolutely. So the structure I put in place was what I would put in place for any major investigation that I respond to round about the priority areas, round about the loci, round about the significant witnesses, round about CCTV, round about house-to-house, door-to-door, round about any potential suspects. So again, all those areas are very familiar and consistent.

But again the -- what also is -- the hypotheses which I'm developing over the course of that early morning, one of them being restraint, and filtering from that is why was there excessive restraint if that thereafter basically comes out from the personal initial accounts of some other evidential stream that there has been excessive force utilised due to the fact that it's

been racially motivated.

So again, that aspect sits very clearly with that hypothesis round about excessive force and restraint being used around that. So, as well as keeping in place all of the significant powers for the investigation which allows it to basically progress, and as I said earlier on, I think it was last week, the timeline and the movements of Mr Bayoh right from the incident at the home address in Arran Crescent to Hayfield Road, it was quite quickly established what we had, the aspect that we did not have was what occurred at Hayfield Road regarding restraint with the force used by the officers: was it excessive, was it reasonable? And also what was the motivation around that in that respect? So again, there was gaps, as I said before, and I was never going to close those gaps on 3 May.

Q. Looking back at the events in May 2015, and thinking about how things could be improved, can you think of any way that, you know, an awareness of the situation and the wider implications, the public concerns about cases such as the ones you mention here in paragraph 47, how can those wider concerns be reflected in the actions that you take in relation to an investigation? So are there any actions that you think could be even automatically included in any investigation into

an unexplained death of a black man that would focus and prioritise the issue of race in that investigation?

A. So the media strategy is significant, and again the aspect of the reluctance to basically be more overt with the media strategy on day one, I think had a significant impact on the public perception. Saying very little or nothing at all I don't think assisted that public perception of what we had. The issue around what I seen was a legitimate expectation of my officers providing me with operational statements I believe was also significant, and the public perception of how that would look, the fact that officers working for Police Scotland and involved in the response to a significant incident were refusing at that time to provide operational statements or personal initial accounts, so the public perception around that as well.

I think the media, I think it's important that we do get that right round about how we can provide that more transparent overview of what's occurred and that we are taking into account and consideration the aspect of race, and also the response by my own officers on that particular day.

So what we've got is the public perception is that they've seen very little coming from the investigation, it's almost a closed shop, for want of a better word,

and the fact is that that, I've no doubt, caused

community unrest, caused anxiety and concern with the

family -- quite rightly so -- the fact that, obviously

the kind of mixed messages that came from the death

message as such.

So I think there's a few things we could have done better in respect of being more open and transparent round about the wider consideration that race was a potential factor.

- Q. And can you explain how an enhanced media strategy would assist your investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh?
- A. Yeah. So I think that being overt with the media around the fact that we are looking for eyewitnesses to the incident, we are looking for anyone with dashcam footage, we are looking for any conversations on social media, for example, areas such as that, but almost that we -- it's a proactive media strategy that's developed other than all we are simply doing is reacting and putting -- and if asked are putting very few lines into the public domain, which I don't think helped, because it did look on reflection that we were potentially holding back information, whereby if we were far more proactive with the media side of things that it may have answered a lot of questions and again we could have involved the family with that as well and how that

- would have eventually played out. So I think there was some learning from myself around it as well.
- Q. You've talked about statements. When you talk about the benefit that would have had to your inquiry, would initial personal accounts have been sufficient to help?
- Yes. Basic facts, initial personal accounts would have 6 Α. 7 been significant in respect of who done what, who was 8 there and what was the use of force. We didn't have that. So you can take the investigation up to a certain 9 10 extent, but because of the complete refusal of the officers to engage at that stage on 3 May, 4 May and 11 12 thereafter into the early part of June, what we had was 13 that significant gap in the understanding of PIRC, Police Scotland, regarding what actions the officers 14 15 done at the scene and during the restraint.
 - Q. If you'd been instructed or ordered on 3 May to investigate race, so not just a hypothesis --
- 18 A. Yeah.

16

17

- Q. -- you were working on but a specific instruction, how could that have translated into priority actions in your daybook?
- 22 A. So I think it probably would have came or emerged from
 23 a number of the priority actions that had been -- had
 24 developed at that particular time. But it was
 25 a consideration by me, it was a consideration by -- as

1 I say, Lesley Boal mentions it in her statement as well. 2 I mean, it was the critical aspect to the incident, it was declared a critical incident at 9.10, the Gold Group 3 4 structure got put in place, the whole aspect of race was 5 significant and it was paramount throughout the course of the days I was involved in it. 6 7 Q. Can I ask you about paragraphs 491 and 492 of your 8 Inquiry statement, please. 491 and 492. 9 (Pause) 10 While we're getting that on the screen, I think there's comment in these about the threat level, severe 11 12 threat level, and you mentioned this last week. 13 Α. Yeah. We talked about this, and the perception that -- here we 14 Q. 15 are, 491 -- and you'll see that: "... in a climate where there had been a number of 16 well publicised deaths of black males in custody -17 18 particularly in England and the USA - where restraint had been a potential contributory factor." 19 20 And you talk about Lee Rigby and the threat level 21 raised to severe. 22 Then at 492, again you talk about the threat level, 23 and then 493: "It was the perception that could possibly be taken 24 from the incident in Kirkcaldy that it could be seen as 25

1 some perhaps related to a terrorist activity or incident - but we knew it was not." 2 3 Would it be fair to say that you were focusing there 4 in your statement about maybe the public wrongly 5 assuming that 3 May was a terror incident rather than you having any basis for thinking that? 6 7 Probably about both, you know what I mean, as I've Α. 8 explained before, one of the hypotheses was: was it 9 terror-related? Which we were quite quickly able to 10 eliminate. But because of the climate and the landscape on 2015 with the attacks I've mentioned and the threat 11 12 level at that level, the media reaction to something 13 such as this undoubtedly would have caused public 14 concern that they were potentially terror-related. 15 Again, that links back into a more proactive media strategy to eliminate that suggestion. 16 Earlier you've mentioned -- it was probably up the 17 Q. 18 screen -- you have mentioned Lee Rigby, we've heard 19 a number of witnesses talk about Lee Rigby in 2013, and 20 we understand he was murdered by extremists who were 21 Muslim and they were black. Did you have any concerns 22 in May 2015 that there might be preconceived ideas about Mr Bayoh, that he was some sort of terrorist extremist? 23 No. It was one of the early hypotheses I had that we 24 Α. 25 had to eliminate the potential that it was

1 terror-related, but we could do -- we've done that 2 fairly quickly, within the first two hours, to be honest 3 with you, you know what I mean, and there was no 4 inference at all that it was terror-related. I think 5 what I was trying to put over in the paragraphs there was it was a completely different landscape then from 6 7 where we are now with these things, and I think it was 8 also the public perception as well as the perception 9 within law enforcement round about that threat level, 10 round about the anxiety of responding to such as a knife-related incident and how rare this -- something 11 12 like this was on a Sunday morning within Kirkcaldy. 13 So I've no doubt in the back of the officers' minds 14 that they were attending -- they were probably unsure 15 what they were responding to at that particular time and I daresay they were keeping all options open regarding 16 what we were dealing with. 17 18 So given what you knew about the threat levels at that Q. 19 time, do you think all officers would be considering 20 possible terrorism for attending a knife incident? 21 Α. I can't speak for all officers, but I can -- I mean, 22 when I was made aware of the incident, did I think that 23 this could potentially be terror-related? Yeah, I did, but that was only one of a number of different 24 25 hypotheses that I had in my head, so I think to not have

1 that you probably wouldn't be doing your job, I wouldn't 2 be doing my job, because you have to eliminate the 3 potential that this is terror-related which, as I say, 4 we were able to eliminate very, very quickly. 5 Thank you. Q. 6 Can I ask you to look at now paragraph 59. Sorry, 7 I'm going way back to the beginning: 8 "When I got the initial call ..." 9 There we are. If we just go up the page slightly so 10 you can see that. You've got a hard copy of your Inquiry statement if you wish to look at that. 11 12 Α. No, it's okay. 13 This is 59, second paragraph, and it talks here about: Q. " ... I just kept an open mind around what had 14 15 occurred and began to consider the wider implications ..." 16 17 Is that what you were talking about shortly -- just a moment ago, about the wider --18 19 Yeah. Α. 20 And they were being discussed at the Gold Group meeting? Q. 21 Α. Yeah. 22 And then, towards the bottom of that paragraph, if we Q. could move down slightly, sorry, and it says: 23 24 "I had a wider appreciation and open-mindedness 25 about what I was going to face at Kirkcaldy Police

1 Office before I became actively involved there. Was 2 this an incident triggered by ideology, or was this an incident simply involving the arrest of an individual 3 4 and that this individual was black." 5 And that's really what you were talking about 6 a moment ago, is it? 7 Α. Yeah, I think it was just about keeping that open mind, 8 I think the work I had done prior to attending at Kirkcaldy, I was in a good place around the strategy 9 10 I had in mind to manage the various hypotheses as we went through the course of the morning, and again the 11 12 terror aspect and the link to counterterrorism we 13 eliminated very, very quickly. Q. If we can go back up the page, please, do we see that 14 15 just prior to the bit I read out you talk about you: "... anticipated that due to the circumstances of 16 the incident it might gain significant media interest as 17 18 well as impact on the local community, particularly on minority groups." 19 20 What was it about the incident that made you 21 particularly concerned about the impact on minority 22 groups? 23 A. I think it was just the climate within the UK, the previous incidents involving the death of a black male 24 25 whilst being restrained or in custody, and, as I say,

1 you know what I mean, I thought, I knew right away that this was going to be a significant investigation, even 2 3 at that early stage, and that I didn't delay getting 4 there, I left almost immediately because I knew the 5 challenging nature of what basically I was going to be confronted with. The --6 7 Q. So even before attending the Gold Group meeting? 8 Α. Yeah. -- where these implications were discussed, you said you 9 Q. 10 realised pretty much immediately --11 Α. Yeah. 12 Q. -- that there would be ..? 13 Yeah. Α. You gave evidence last week about doing checks, intel, 14 Q. 15 background checks, that type of thing, and you mentioned that in connection with looking at your daybook. You've 16 17 talked about the counterterrorism hypotheses. As part 18 of that counterterrorism hypothesis and investigating 19 that as a possibility, as I understand it, the police 20 will carry out certain checks looking for intel --21 Α. Yeah. 22 -- to see if there's any evidence available that would Q. 23 back up --24 Α. Yes.

Q. -- that counterterrorism hypothesis. As part of that

25

1 investigative strand, would you instruct checks to be carried out on a variety of people involved in the 2 3 incident? 4 Α. So ... 5 Or only the deceased? Q. No, I think -- no, I mean, I think I explained it last 6 Α. 7 week, I may not have explained it very well, but we 8 usually have an intelligence cell attached to any major 9 investigation. That -- I mean, that could be literally 10 two people doing all the background checks round about anyone who comes into an investigation. 11 12 Regarding the CT side of things, or 13 counter-terrorism or terror-linked, I think there's 14 probably two aspects to that. One is the aspect of the 15 background awareness of UK policing, and I include within that the UK CT network around who this individual 16 17 is and if there's any background that we should be aware of round about ideology, or round about threat. 18 19 And then there's a second aspect about looking more 20 closely at the individual himself, what we might know 21 about him, such as what we might find in the house what 22 do we find in his property, what's on his mobile phone, 23 what's on his computer system? 24 And I don't just mean that for Mr Bayoh, I mean in general around that, that's what we would normally do. 25

- 1 So again, as well as doing the background intelligence
- 2 checks nationally, internationally as well, we would
- 3 also do that whole thorough examination of the
- 4 background of the individual as well.
- 5 Q. You've talked about doing those checks in relation to
- 6 Mr Bayoh; what about his family?
- 7 A. No. Unless there was something that came up and it was
- 8 highlighted through the work we were doing round about
- 9 the background of Mr Bayoh, we would not naturally go
- 10 through the full family unit in respect of that.
- 11 Q. What about friends who may be witnesses?
- 12 A. So friends that came into the investigation, I can't
- confirm, but unlikely for CT, it would mainly just be
- 14 background checks on our normal police systems that
- we've access to. So, as I say, it would not be that
- more thorough examination of the wider aspect of any
- 17 sensitive information that may be held on some our
- 18 partner systems as such.
- 19 Q. Would the intel cell or unit be part of those checks if
- they weren't specifically CT checks?
- 21 A. Yeah, so they would deal with general checks across the
- 22 investigation as it progresses, they would be there from
- 23 day one right through to complete, and they would do the
- 24 background checks of any individual of note who came
- 25 into the investigation round about did we need to

- 1 approach them, was there a threat from the individual, was there background that we needed to know? 2 3 So that would all be done with that. The reference 4 to the wider aspect of the CT side would be through the 5 National Intelligence Bureau and into the wider UK CT network, that we would do the more sensitive checks 6 7 around was there anything at all indicating that this 8 was going to take place on 3 May in Kirkcaldy, 9 for example. 10 Q. You said you've ruled out CT very quickly. What involvement did you have in engaging with the intel cell 11 12 who were carrying out these checks? I had no involvement. 13 Α. 14 Q. So who did? 15 So that would have been done through the investigation, Α. I think it was done initially with Colin Robson into the 16 17 intel side, or Graeme Dursley, and thereafter the second 18 day we had the intelligence structure coming in from the 19 MIT side, the Major Investigation Team, they would have 20 come in on day two.
- Q. So from day two, 4 May, checks in relation to intel or through the intel cell would be sort of led by MIT?
- 23 A. MIT, yeah, obviously under the guidance of PIRC.
- Q. Under the guidance of PIRC, and from 4 May you've said that was Billy Little?

25

1 Α. Yes. 2 And in what circumstances would you anticipate it being Q. 3 of assistance to your inquiry to conduct checks on 4 a person's legal representatives? 5 (Pause). I wouldn't imagine we would require to do Α. 6 that. 7 Q. Is that something you had any involvement in, in 8 relation to these events? Absolutely not. 9 Α. 10 Q. Can you see anything in your own investigation and the hypotheses and the strategies you were developing where 11 12 information or intel about a person's legal 13 representatives would have assisted you? No, I had no involvement in any aspect of that. 14 Α. 15 And can you see any way that that intel might have Q. assisted your investigation in any way, the 16 17 investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh? 18 Α. No. 19 And once you ruled out counterterrorism very quickly, Q. 20 can you explain to us why further intel checks may have 21 been required in relation to your investigation? It does take a bit of time sometimes to run some of 22 Α. these checks through, but the information I was getting 23 24 back was that there was nothing of any -- any concern

that we could see around any -- that's been triggered,

1 as I say in my statement, by any ideology. There was no CT aspect to it whatsoever. But again, we would run 2 3 through the necessary checks, and as I've said they do 4 take a bit of time sometimes if we are looking at some 5 of the international checks that we need to carry out. So -- and I mean, I think it was mentioned at one of the 6 7 Gold Groups that we'd kind of almost wholly eliminated 8 the aspect of CT. 9 Q. And from the way you're describing it I think the focus 10 for you as part of the investigation was more about Mr Bayoh's potential ideology, that's what you were 11 12 interested in, if that existed? 13 Yeah, that was one of the early hypotheses, as Α. 14 I indicated, you know what I mean, it was only one of 15 those which again that was one that we could almost eliminate very, very quickly. And again, the other 16 17 hypotheses thereafter remained open as 3 and 4 May 18 progressed. 19 Thank you. Q. 20 Can I ask you to look at another paragraph in your 21 Inquiry statement, please, 488: "I have been asked to what extent Sheku Bayoh's race 22 was a factor in my actions and decisions in this 23 24 enquiry. None whatsoever." 25 I think you've expanded on that today.

1 Α. Yes. "I have never made any decisions throughout my service, 2 Q. 3 and also in my personal life, based on someone's race or 4 ethnicity, or religion. The wider post-mortem 5 considerations and the management of the remains of Sheku, that was not to do with race as such but more to 6 do with his religion. Nothing I did, and no decisions 7 8 I made, were influenced negatively in any way by race. 9 It was positive that we had an understanding of family 10 concerns in areas surrounding that issue. In the time I was involved in the investigation, race was never 11 12 a factor in my outlook, decision-making or in any of the 13 investigative strategies which I put in place. I had, 14 and have, no negative preconceptions regarding race. 15 I would say that I am anti-racist. Racism from my personal perspective is utterly deplorable and has no 16 17 place either in policing or in society at large." This expression "anti-racist", is that your 18 19 expression? No. However, it's something that I'm fully behind. 20 Α. 21 I think it was raised by the Chief Constable in one of 22 his bulletins to Police Scotland as such, indicating that we have to be proactively anti-racist, which I did 23

Q. It may have been said at an opening statement in this

agree with 100%.

24

25

- 1 Inquiry as well.
- 2 A. Was it? Oh, sorry. It is certainly on the force
- 3 intranet as something the Chief has said.
- 4 Q. So in relation to the Chief Constable making those
- 5 comments, has that influenced you --
- A. I thought it was really accurate. I think that's the
- 7 perception I have regarding it. It's just a total zero
- 8 tolerance approach to it as such.
- 9 Q. Can you explain from your own perspective what the
- 10 difference is for you between being anti-racist and
- 11 simply being -- acting in a way that's
- 12 non-discriminatory?
- 13 A. I'll do my best. I think anti-racist is that you
- 14 proactively drive some of the aspects of discrimination
- 15 you may see. So I'll give you an example, and sorry,
- it's not in my statement, but in 2019 two officers I had
- deployed down south for an investigation were involved
- in an incident involving two officers from a force down
- 19 south and an Asian taxi driver, and basically what it
- 20 was was the two officers from the force down south had
- 21 made a racist remark to the taxi driver which caused the
- 22 taxi driver to stop the vehicle and ask all occupants to
- 23 remove themselves from it, and there was further racial
- 24 remarks made at that time by the two officers from down
- south.

1 Now, that wasn't reported at the time by the taxi driver but it was reported to me when the officers 2 3 returned by one of the officers who confided in me and 4 said this is what she had encountered and she just 5 couldn't let it go. So, rather than simply just saying, "Okay, let's take a learning from that", what we did do 6 7 was -- and again, this probably comes round about the 8 aspect of being anti-racist and being proactive around 9 it, so statements from both of the officers from 10 Police Scotland, I contacted the force down south in 11 respect of that, we produced a report, and asked them to 12 fully investigate, which they did do. The taxi driver 13 had CCTV footage within the taxi, and again we 14 thereafter put the full report down south to the force 15 and thereafter asked them to investigate in respect of criminality and any misconduct in respect of the two 16 17 officers involved in it. 18 So it was just that aspect of although it's not 19 reported, although it's happened elsewhere, the fact is 20 there should be that more proactive approach to these 21 aspects, and I think -- I don't know if that maybe 22 underlines exactly what I mean about being anti-racist, about being proactive around it. 23 You mentioned that the female, you said she couldn't let 24 Q. 25 it go --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- is there a culture encouraging officers to let things
- 3 go?
- 4 A. No, I don't -- certainly not now.
- 5 Q. Was this a while ago?
- 6 A. No, this was in 2019. So I think aspects of -- now I'm
- 7 going back 25 years, you know what I mean, aspects of
- 8 some conduct by police officers in respect of kind of
- 9 sexist remarks and misogyny or even sectarianism and
- 10 bigotry was probably more commonplace 25 years ago than
- it is now, thankfully.
- As I say, the journey we've came on, the journey
- 13 I've came on, since that particular time to where we are
- 14 now, it's completely turned out thankfully. So, as
- I say, I wouldn't have expected her to let it go, and
- 16 certainly I wasn't going to let it go in respect of
- 17 that.
- Q. I appreciate your own views on this, you've obviously
- 19 got a number of officers working with you as part of
- 20 your investigative team in May 2015. You've described
- 21 how many of these officers you'd never necessarily
- worked with.
- 23 A. Yeah.
- Q. You'd not met before. How do you, as a leader, share
- 25 your own views about being anti-racist and being

A. Yeah. So it's difficult to do when you're on call and you're responding to an incident such as this because you can only really do that at any briefing you have with the officers when you can obviously detail what

proactive in these matters with a team, with your team?

your thoughts and what your concerns are, and obviously

the approach that should be taken around it.

It's more -- it's probably easier to do in your day-to-day role whereby you have a distinct divisional team of officers whereby you can put forward that message, messaging, that you can inform that culture on a more informed basis because you are almost working daily with the officers concerned. A lot of that comes from some of the work that we do round about what we call a people board within specialist crime division, round about that whole aspect to equality and diversity, inclusion and some of the work that is ongoing across the force just now around that.

So it's easier to do -- I think my answer to your question is easier to do with your day-to-day activities as a leader within the organisation. It's more challenging and more difficult to do when you're maybe only there one or two days, you know what I mean, and you can only really do that at the briefing in the morning or the briefing at close of play, and again

it's -- you are thereafter looking for, such as in this 1 2 instance, for the PIRC and for the MIT to take on that 3 longer term assessment and information to the 4 investigative team round about any considerations that 5 they may have. MS GRAHAME: Right. 6 7 I do have one or two further questions but I'm 8 conscious of the time. This might be an appropriate --9 LORD BRACADALE: We need to have a break for the 10 stenographer of 15 minutes. (2.58 pm)11 12 (A short break) 13 (3.21 pm)14 MS GRAHAME: Is unconscious bias something that you're aware 15 of? 16 Α. Yes. Have you had any training in unconscious bias? 17 Q. A. Yes, I have. 18 Q. We heard evidence from Conrad Trickett about unconscious 19 20 bias and his understanding of the position. If you've 21 also had training in unconscious bias, have you held a mirror up to yourself to identify any? 22 A. I don't think I'll be as eloquent as Conrad was in my 23 24 description of it. Yeah, it's the thread going through 25 all our training that we're involved in just now across

1 Police Scotland. The most recent one I done was 2 February this year, I think it is detailed in my SCoPE 3 record, which was the new Moodle training for EDI, where 4 there's a whole aspect on unconscious bias. 5 So again it's, I think it's -- to me it's a pretty challenging concept around the aspect of that lifetime 6 7 of experiences which subconsciously impact on your 8 decision-making, and again how you reflect on that and ensure that any stereotypes or anything at all, 9 10 preconceptions, don't ultimately impact on your decision-making. So that's the way -- what I took from 11 12 the learning of it. 13 Regarding holding the mirror up, that was -- it 14 wasn't part of the last training I'd done online, but it 15 was a previous course I'd done, which was in person at the force training centre at Jackton, was around that as 16 17 well, and a similar course where -- selection panel training, where the aspect of, I think they called it 18 affinity bias at the time, round about you almost 19 20 attempt to recruit or promote people with similar 21 characteristics and attributes as yourself. 22 So I think it's something certainly within the force now, within Police Scotland, we're all very much aware 23 of and take into cognisance round about our 24 25 decision-making.

- 1 Q. How comfortable or confident do you feel in identifying 2 your own unconscious bias?
- I don't think you're comfortable with it, I think it's 3 Α. 4 something you have to do as a leader in the 5 organisation, I think it's appropriate that you do do it. So, as I say, it's something that you do have to 6 7 look pretty deep and detailed around your subconscious, 8 your decision-making, your -- the stereotypes you have 9 in your life. I mean, this hasn't just came from the 10 27 years I've been in the police, this is obviously all tucked in -- all impacted on my subconscious over the 11

last 50 years of my life.

- So, as I say, I think it's something that is,

 it's -- I think it's pretty significant, it's good to

 have that realisation exactly what it is and how it does

 impact on your own -- your own leadership attributes and

 about how you can ensure that it doesn't negatively

 impact on your decision-making, particularly at

 a strategic level.
 - Q. Of the training you've had so far from Police Scotland into the concept of affinity bias or unconscious bias --
- 22 A. Yeah.

12

20

21

Q. -- do you feel that's provided you with any strategies
that would allow you to identify unconscious bias either
in yourself or in other officers?

A. I think it does, yeah. There is that greater awareness now across the force around it. It's nothing that you try to hide or basically do not take into account. So the affinity bias aspect round about selection panel interview, I can see that, I potentially was involved in some of that, to be honest, round about the fact, that preconception round about you've worked with that individual, you know how good that individual is so you want that individual as part of your team.

And again, it's only once you have that training around it you begin to actually understand, well, there has to be a more open and transparent approach to this in respect -- and that's just an example now about selection interviewing and such. So, as I say, it's something that -- very much accepted, any aspect of decision-making, that there undoubtedly will be some aspect of unconscious bias that you have to consider, not just maybe with yourself but with the team and with the individuals that are around you at that stage.

- Q. And do you feel any of the training has given you tools or strategies that you could use in your day-to-day work that would help you to flush out any unconscious bias or identify unconscious bias?
- A. Yeah, I think it comes back to stereotypes, you know what I mean, it's round about -- I know Conrad spoke

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 about the pilot being a male and round about the ${\tt HGV}$ 2 driver reversing the truck, that you automatically 3 think -- that aspect -- it's a man that's driving the 4 vehicle. But I think there's a kind of wider aspect to 5 that, and I think it's about -- with the individuals that you're leading or directing or are part of your 6 7 team at that stage, it's about having that confidence to 8 basically flush out what some of the biases are at that 9 stage and thereafter basically address them head-on, and 10 thereafter -- therefore you can ensure that it doesn't impact negatively on your decision-making because you 11 12 have went through that whole thorough, transparent 13 process of bringing out some of these inherent biases 14 that exist within us all. 15 Q. And do you feel it's allowed you not just to identify biases but to actually guard against them, not just 16 17 simply tick a box saying, "That's a bias", but to 18 actually alter your behaviour or the behaviour of others, having recognised a bias? 19

A. Yeah, I think it does. And I think it's something you need to be really strong with as well. So it's having that confidence that if you do recognise a bias and -- I mean, I can think of one or two I've been involved in -- but I think it's how you thereafter communicate with your team round about the fact that we have to bring

- 1 this out into the open, this can't be a consideration in
- 2 respect of the kind of stereotypical attitude you may
- 3 have towards some ethnic group or so on and so forth,
- 4 and thereafter to bring that out into the open and
- 5 thereafter address it, as I say, kind of head-on as
- 6 such.
- 7 Q. Can I ask you if the term racial threat theory means
- 8 anything to you?
- 9 A. I don't think I picked that up through the training, no.
- 10 Q. What about the idea or preconceived idea that black men
- 11 are more likely to be dangerous?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Are you aware of racial stereotypes in relation to black
- men, in relation to policing and crime? For example,
- we've heard some examples that may be classed that way
- of Mr Bayoh being the size of a house, having superhuman
- 17 strength, there may be other racial stereotypes of black
- men being more engaged in criminality, perhaps being
- 19 members of gangs, or as I've said being more likely to
- 20 be violent, dangerous.
- 21 A. Yeah.
- Q. Have you heard of these?
- 23 A. Yeah.
- Q. And what steps -- in your role as SIO in May 2015, what
- 25 steps did you take to investigate whether any of the

officers in their actions in Hayfield Road were
influenced by racial stereotypes or negative perceptions
about Mr Bayoh as a black man?

A. That would be something that would have to be considered through the course of the investigation. As I say, responding on day one to this with the actions of personal initial accounts was something that was going to be very difficult to do within that first 24 hours of the investigation, but that would be something that would have to be obviously taken into account once we began to get some sort of operational statement or more developed statement from them round about that whole aspect of, as you describe, some of the stereotypes that you've detailed there.

But on that first day, whilst responding to a critical incident, in the absence of engagement with the officers concerned, that was extremely difficult to engage with them around that aspect. Difficult to engage with them around the submission of a statement or a personal initial account, never mind anything else at that point. But that would obviously be something that I would suggest would come from the more detailed investigation as it progresses.

Q. And when you talk about paperwork, would that include the use of force forms or the use of spray forms that

- 1 weren't completed? 2 Yes, absolutely, yeah. Α. What about Airwaves, we've heard evidence about Airwaves 3 Q. 4 calls and discussions that took place and were recorded; 5 we understand that point-to-point aren't recorded, but 6 Airwaves communications amongst the team, did you take 7 steps to recover those? 8 It's one of the actions at that early stage was round Α. 9 about the recovery of all the transmissions around that. 10 So again, that would be something that we would basically ... other than a general assessment in the 11 12 first couple of days of it, I mean, the aspect of 13 seizing it and thereafter looking at basically getting 14 it, getting some statement around it would follow 15 through the course of the general investigation, but it's significant to any investigation, a 999 call from 16 17 any distressed individual, for example for a homicide, 18 that would be significant and we would listen to 19 immediately. 20 So you would recover 999 calls, Airwaves? Q. Yeah.
- 21 Α.
- You talked about call cards, STORM cards, previously; 22 Q. 23 you looked at those on the morning of the 3rd?
- 24 Correct. Α.
- 25 Q. Does your daybook detail the Airwaves messages?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. No? Is there anything in your policy file?
- 3 A. No. As I say, it's more a kind of general action around
- 4 Airwaves, it would be -- someone would be given the
- 5 aspect of: go and basically detail everything on
- Airwaves, secure from the control room through
- 7 3C Division around everything at all linked to this
- 8 incident we're investigating, and plus transcription of
- 9 all the recordings so we can thereafter begin to drill
- down and examine them in detail.
- 11 Q. Who would be tasked with that type of role?
- 12 A. It would be part of the investigation team, so you'd
- have two detectives actioned around that and they would
- 14 have that whole aspect to go and basically engage with
- 3C Division, which is the command and control aspect of
- it, to obtain -- as well as the details from STORM, the
- call cards, but also the Airwave traffic to inform the
- 18 various individuals involved in the investigation.
- 19 Q. Is that something you instructed on 3 May?
- A. No, it wasn't, no.
- 21 Q. Why not?
- 22 A. It was an action, it was an ancillary action that would
- 23 have been progressed through the course of the first few
- 24 days, but at that time with the resources we had there
- 25 was far more significant actions to basically be

1		progressed, with the finite resources we had at that
2		time.
3	Q.	Did you have concern about the finite resources you had?
4	Α.	On day one, we were quickly supported by MIT in the
5		afternoon, and on day two the MIT basically came in with
6		quite significant numbers, which was ideal. A Sunday
7		morning in Police Scotland, you don't have significant
8		resources on in general, particularly within the CID or
9		detectives as such, so it usually is quite a challenging
10		period, particularly during the changeover of shift as
11		well, between that 6, 7 o'clock in the morning period.
L2		So we did well, I did my best to bring resources
13		from around the force together for to carry out the
L 4		investigation and the first day, as I say, we had great
L5		support across the force. But you never have enough
16		resources, as you can imagine.
L7	Q.	Yes.
18		And then finally, one of the things we discussed
L9		with Colin Robson was whether he would have had access
20		in 2015 to disciplinary records or misconduct records in
21		relation to the officers who had attended Hayfield Road.
22		Is that something you considered recovering as part
23		of your investigation?
24	Α.	On day one and day two it wasn't, but we would have
25		access to them and we'd have an out of access contact

1 for that, so Craig Blackhall was PSD on-call, he was a superintendent, so if we did require anything from 2 3 Craig, I'm sure he would have facilitated that for us. 4 But, as I say, in that initial response to such 5 a critical incident, it wasn't an immediate priority, although obviously the subsequent investigation around 6 7 that would bring that with it. But on that initial 12, 8 24 hours, it wasn't an initial priority for me. Could you just give me one moment, please? 9 Q. 10 Α. Okay. (Pause) 11 12 MS GRAHAME: Thank you very much. I have no further 13 questions. 14 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. 15 I'll come to Mr Macleod in a moment under Rule 9.2. Are there any other Rule 9 applications? 16 17 Mr Campbell, would you mind withdrawing to the witness room, please. 18 19 (In the absence of the witness) 20 LORD BRACADALE: Yes, Ms Mitchell. 21 Rule 9 Application by MS MITCHELL 22 MS MITCHELL: Again, I'm obliged to my learned friend who's incorporated many of the questions that we put in our 23 24 Rule 9. 25 The first issue that I'd like to raise with this

1 witness is in relation to his interactions with PIRC and 2 Officer Harrower. What I would like to explore with him 3 is whether or not PIRC actually expressed the view, 4 anyone in PIRC, to him directly that they did not have 5 enough resources and as a result they would need to use resources from Police Scotland. The issue of resources 6 7 is dealt with broadly, but what I'm looking for was: was 8 there an actual discussion where perhaps the Officer Harrower said, "I don't have enough staff to 9 10 cover this"? And also in relation to handover to PIRC, when the handover happened, were the hypotheses that had 11 12 been ruled in and ruled out discussed as part of the 13 handover? 14 Moving then on, it's a discrete issue, and it is in 15 relation to Collette and her mum. This officer said, I think yesterday -- sorry, not yesterday, 16 Friday(sic) -- that: 17 "Answer: I wasn't aware, and it would probably 18 19 beneficial if her mother could maybe have taken her 20 child, but I appreciate she was breastfeeding and that's 21 obviously more difficult." 22 The Inquiry will remember that Collette's very strong memory of events was that there was such 23 a request in fact for the mum and the baby not to come 24 to the police station, and it's just to explore a little 25

more with this witness why he says that it would be better if the witness had not come, as it may be an issue which will allow the Inquiry to come to the view that Collette's recollection in this matter is to be preferred.

The next matter is in relation to Zahid Saeed's sister and the search that was conducted of the family home. Now, Zahid Saeed's sister came to give evidence, and as I understand it, she may wish to give further evidence, particularly in relation to the fact that she was searched bodily, like at the airport, by a female officer, that she had her bag searched, and the officer searched her car, including moving the car seats back and forward and checking the boot.

So, as it was put to this witness in the hypothetical about Martyn Dick and whether or not he considered that appropriate, I would just like to put it to this witness as well whether or not, given the fact that this isn't even a witness but a sister of a witness in a case, whether or not that was appropriate.

The next again discrete point arises from the Gold Group meeting at 20.18 on 3 May -- that's, for records, PS03139 -- and it is discussing the description of Zahid Saeed, when he is described as an associate of Mr Bayoh's, and I want to explore with this witness

1 whether or not the word "associate" in the context of 2 police language or discussion has any connotation. 3 Next, family concerns in relation to post-mortem 4 arrangements. We've heard evidence that this witness 5 spoke to Dave Green who said in effect, "This is when the post-mortem is happening because that's the only 6 7 availability we have". What I would like to explore 8 with this witness is when he was told that and simply 9 why wasn't the family told that as the position? He 10 must have known that relatively early on, given his handover to PIRC, and I would like to explore that if he 11 12 knew that and he knew that the PM was going to be taking 13 place at this time, why wasn't there simply a line of 14 communication to explain that to the family? 15 Next, moving on to the issue of what I've described here as the default position that police were acting 16 17 legitimately. My learned friend has taken this witness 18 through in some detail the fact that there was a gap in his knowledge and that gap related to what happened 19 20 during the course of events in Hayfield Road in relation 21 to force and in relation to what happened, and in 22 fairness to this witness he repeatedly makes reference to the fact that he doesn't have this information. 23 24 What I would like for him to consider is

paragraph 140 of his statement. If I might just read

25

1 this out, it says: "From the information that I had at that time, 2 3 Sheku Bayoh was in possession of a knife a very short 4 time prior to the altercation with the police on 5 Hayfield Road. The actions and use of force from what I had established from an early stage led me to conclude 6 7 that the force used would be necessary and proportionate 8 to restrain Sheku and there was nothing else to the contrary based on the information that I had." 9 10 So what I would like to investigate with this particular officer is: first of all, he didn't have any 11 12 information on the use of force, never mind indeed 13 whether or not it was necessary and proportionate, and 14 whether or not in effect it appears that he has taken 15 a default position that, unless something came to his attention, the use of force was necessary and 16 17 proportionate, whilst he was still involved in 18 the enquiry. 19 Lastly in relation to race, the officer gave 20 evidence saying that there was a wider aspect to the 21 issue of flushing out racism, and he said: "Answer: It's about -- with the individuals that 22 23 you're leading or directing or are part of your team at that stage, it's about having that confidence to 24 basically flush out what some of the biases are at that 25

```
1
             stage and thereafter basically address them head-on, and
 2
             thereafter -- therefore you can ensure that it doesn't
 3
             impact negatively on your decision-making ..."
                 What I would like to ask the witness is whether or
 4
 5
             not he has in fact put that into practice and whether or
             not he has addressed issues relating to race head-on and
 6
 7
             made any progress in respect of bringing out the
             inherent biases that exist within us all.
 8
 9
                 Those are my questions.
10
         LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. I'll rise to consider these
             submissions.
11
12
                 Before I do so, Mr Macleod, leaving aside any
13
             questions that I allow Ms Mitchell to ask, do you
14
             anticipate any broader Rule 9.2 application?
15
         MR MACLEOD: No, sir.
         LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. Right, I'll rise to consider
16
17
             this.
         (3.44 pm)
18
19
                                (A short break)
20
         (4.01 pm)
21
         LORD BRACADALE: I shall allow Ms Mitchell to ask questions
             about whether Mr Harrower expressed views about the
22
             resources of PIRC and whether the specific hypotheses
23
24
             were discussed.
25
                 In relation to the issue of whether the mother of
```

1 Collette could have taken the baby away, I do not consider that I would be assisted by further exploration 2 3 of that with this witness, so I shall not allow that to 4 be explored. In relation to the additional information from 5 Saadia Rashid, the sister of Zahid Saeed, the way to 6 7 approach this, in my view, is for additional 8 investigation to be carried out by the Inquiry in 9 relation to any additional information that she wishes 10 to advance, and until that is done it would not be appropriate to explore this on a hypothetical basis with 11 12 this witness. So I shall not allow that. 13 In relation to the meaning of the word "associate", 14 I don't think I would be assisted by any explanation of 15 that. I shall allow the proposed questioning in relation 16 17 to telling the family about the post-mortem 18 arrangements. 19 As to the default position expressed in 20 paragraph 140 of the statement, I have to consider that 21 in the light of the whole evidence of the witness, and when I come to do that I do not think I shall be 22 assisted by any further exploration of the issue. 23 24 In relation to the last issue in relation to race, 25 I consider that the issue of race has been sufficiently

1	explored with this witness, so I shall not allow
2	questioning on that either.
3	So, on that restricted basis, I shall allow you to
4	ask questions, Ms Mitchell.
5	Can we have the witness back.
6	(In the presence of the witness)
7	Questions from MS MITCHELL
8	LORD BRACADALE: Mr Campbell, Ms Mitchell KC, who acts for
9	the Bayoh families, Sheku Bayoh's families, is going to
LO	ask some questions.
L1	MS MITCHELL: You've explained to the Inquiry about the
L2	finite resources that Police Scotland has, and
L3	particularly at that time on a Sunday morning, and
L 4	you've also explained to the Inquiry that it was clear
L5	to you that PIRC wouldn't be able to simply come in and
L6	take the entire case over simply because of the manpower
L7	that they had at that time.
L8	Was there any expression by Keith Harrower about
L9	needing manpower and how that was to be dealt with?
20	A. No, there wasn't any detailed discussion around it,
21	other than Keith had indicated that with some of the
22	other conversations that it would be the Monday
23	before they would be able to deploy any significant PIRC
24	resources, but that would be unlikely to happen on the
25	Sunday 3 May. And with that it meant we had discussions

- around, as I mentioned last week, around the joint

 deployment of certain specific or specialist posts such

 as crime scene managers or production officers or family

 liaison officers. But there was no detail -- I wasn't

 aware of what that significant resource would look like

 as such.
 - Q. What I was hoping to understand or hoping to assist the Inquiry with understanding was: how was it that you came to know -- other than being told that, "We won't have many folk til tomorrow" -- who to put where?
 - A. So at 13.30 PIRC in its entirety turned up at Kirkcaldy Office, which was roughly I think five officers

 I counted, that was the extent of what we had, and it wasn't until late in the evening of 3 May, I think we managed to get -- or Keith managed to get an additional two out at that stage. I think we managed to obtain two FLOs at that particular stage, which was late in the evening of 3 May. But it was very clear round about capacity that it was very, very limited with PIRC, I was aware of that from the discussion, we weren't going to get 20 PIRC resources at that time, and any significant resources coming from PIRC would probably be the following day, as the enquiry obviously progressed.
 - Q. So can the Inquiry take it that rather than having specific conversation between you and Keith Harrower

- about not having enough resources, it was simply obvious
- 2 from the fact that they turned up and there was only
- 3 five of them, with perhaps two to come, that that would
- 4 simply be insufficient for the job?
- 5 A. Yeah. No, it's clear it was insufficient for the job on
- 6 3 May, and that's why from a Police Scotland perspective
- 7 we'd significant resources pulled from all over the
- 8 country, as well as from the Major Investigation Teams,
- 9 to support the PIRC in respect of the investigation.
- 10 Q. I'd like to move on, please, to talk about the
- 11 post-mortem, and in particular you gave evidence to the
- 12 Inquiry that you relatively early on had a conversation
- with Dave Green, who also gave you information about the
- 14 availability of a pathologist to conduct the
- post-mortem, and would it be fair to say he made it
- 16 clear that the post-mortem would only be going ahead at
- 17 that certain time due to the restrictions that they had?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- 19 Q. Can you recall approximately what time that was you had
- that conversation?
- 21 A. So I spoke to Keith -- sorry, I spoke to Dave Green
- 22 I think two or three times on 3 May, once round about
- 23 lunchtime, which I think was the discussion around the
- 24 post-mortem. Later on in the late afternoon I had
- 25 a further discussion, and that was round about

1 potentially having to look towards other aspects of identification, which I touched on as well, if the next 2 3 of kin or the family did not attend. But I think it was 4 round about the lunchtime conversation I had that 5 discussion round about the availability of -- of the pathologists and the constraints about on that. The 6 7 information that was passed to me by Dave Green at the 8 time was he was looking for identification to take place 1 o'clock, at 1300 hours on the 4th, with the 9 10 post-mortem taking place at 1400 hours, so that was the 11 information I was passed at that time. 12 Q. And that was, as it were, set in stone? It's purely within the jurisdiction of Crown Office, 13 Α. it's absolutely nothing to do with Police Scotland. 14 15 Q. Having that information and knowing that was going to be the case --16 Yeah. 17 Α. 18 -- that there weren't, as it were, other options, did Q. 19 you consider informing the family of that situation? 20 So that information was passed to PIRC as the lead Α. 21 investigator for the -- for this incident. So, as 22 I say, that information was passed to Keith as they 23 thereafter, through the course of the afternoon and into the early evening, became the sole link into the family 24 because of some of the challenges that Police Scotland 25

1 probably had brung on themselves with the deployment or the lack of deployment of family liaison officers. 2 3 So, as I say, it was mainly the PIRC that had that 4 aspect of the investigation, to liaise with the family, 5 to make arrangements for their attendance for identification as the day and the evening progressed. 6 7 So you had the conversation about noon with Q. 8 Dave Green --9 It was later than that. Α. 10 Q. -- or thereabouts? It was later than that, I think it was about 1 o'clock 11 Α. 12 or thereabouts. 13 Okay. Q. 14 Yeah. Α. 15 And then PIRC arrive at 1.30? Q. 16 Α. Yes. And they take over that part of the enquiry? 17 Q. So that -- there was an investigative, not handover but 18 Α. 19 an investigative update to PIRC between myself, my team 20 and PIRC round about 1400 hours, prior to the second 21 Gold Group, which was almost in its entirety handing 22 over to PIRC round about where we were with it, although obviously they had the lead from very early on that day. 23 24 But that aspect was discussed with PIRC at that time 25 round about -- and I believe that Keith had already --

25

1 Keith had also spoke to Dave Green through the course of the early morning around the various aspects and what 2 3 the likelihood of the post-mortem occurring the next day 4 would be. 5 So if we want to know exactly why that information Q. 6 wasn't passed on to the family, that this is when the 7 post-mortem would be taking place --8 Α. Yeah. -- we would have to ask Keith Harrower about that? 9 Q. 10 Α. Yeah, so Keith thereafter had the engagement with the 11 family around that and the deployment of PIRC FLOs. 12 You've discussed the handover, as you've described it, Q. 13 in relation to PIRC, and we understand from your evidence that was effectively a staged process --14 15 Α. Yeah. 16 -- where some things were handed over at an earlier Q. stage than others. When you were handing over the 17 18 reins, as it were, to Keith Harrower, did you discuss 19 the various hypotheses that you had? Yeah, so they were discussed at the investigative 20 Α. 21 meeting at 2 o'clock with PIRC around the progression of 22 the various aspects of the investigation that were being 23 considered at that time. Regarding the handover, as you say, it was a more kind of staged and phased approach 24

which thereafter carried on into the evening of the 3rd

- and even into the morning of 4 May as well, just because

 of the change of investigator or senior investigator

 from PIRC, as I described, with Keith stepping down or
- 4 stepping back and Billy Little coming on at that time.
- Q. When you discussed the various hypotheses, what
 hypotheses did you discuss?
- 7 Α. So the five I detailed earlier on in my evidence round 8 about: was it CT ideology? Was there some aspect of 9 counterterrorism we had to consider? Was it through 10 an earlier assault which had led to the death of Mr Bayoh? But that obviously had only occurred through 11 12 the incident at Hayfield. Was it through to -- was it 13 through alcohol, drink intoxication? Was there an underlying medical condition? So there was a number 14 15 of hypotheses that we were keeping an open mind around
- Q. Was one of the hypotheses that you were keeping an open mind around, and did you pass this on to Keith Harrower, that a black man had died after restraint --
- 20 A. Yeah.

as such.

16

- Q. -- and that was one of the things that had to be considered?
- A. Absolutely. I mean, that was discussed at the 10.22 phone call with Keith round about what we had --
- 25 Q. And was race highlighted in that --

1 Α. It was. 2 -- conversation? Q. I mean, it was clear through all the Gold Group meetings 3 Α. as well that race was front and centre around the 4 5 investigation. I mean, it was a consideration with everything we'd done around it. A conversation with 6 7 Keith very early on was round about one of the 8 hypotheses was: had death came as a result of restraint 9 and by police action? And, again, that was very clear, 10 and the aspect to that was, subsequent to that, was it racially motivated or was there some aspect of that 11 12 racial aggravation which had brought about the aspect of 13 force being excessive as such? So again that was all 14 discussed, and we were keeping an open and transparent 15 mind around all that. LORD BRACADALE: Ms Mitchell, in the light of that evidence, 16 17 I shall allow you to explore the issue in paragraph 140 of the statement. 18 19 MS MITCHELL: I wonder if we could have paragraph 140 of the 20 statement available. 21 Throughout the course of you -- if we can just leave it for a moment, and then I'll ask about it, thank you, 22 just have it available. 23 24 Throughout the course of your giving of evidence and 25 also in relation to your statement, I think it's fair to

- say that you make it clear throughout that you had
 insufficient evidence to conclude your enquiries by the
 time you handed them over?
- 4 A. Yes.
- Q. And the gap in your understanding was very specifically related to what happened at Hayfield Road between the officers and Mr Bayoh?
- 8 A. Yes.
- And I think you make it clear repeatedly that that gap 9 Q. 10 meant that you simply did not know various factors. For example, you did not know about the use of force and 11 12 how it was carried out; you didn't know, we heard in 13 evidence, the fact that it was alleged that PC Tomlinson 14 had truncheoned Mr Bayoh to the head; you didn't know 15 that when Sheku Bayoh was intercepted by the police he didn't have a knife and was holding his hands face up. 16 17 All these things weren't known to you at that time; is 18 that correct?
- A. So the aspect of the knife, I was aware that he wasn't in possession of the knife during the restraint because of where the knife was discarded.
- 22 Q. When --
- A. The other aspects that you're mentioning were as

 accurate -- the Tomlinson thing, I had no knowledge of

 that at all because we did not have any personal initial

1		accounts.
2	Q.	So it would be fair to say, in those circumstances, that
3		you couldn't make an assessment whether or not the use
4		of force was proportionate or was necessary in the
5		circumstance?
6	A.	Yes, that's accurate.
7	Q.	I wonder in the circumstances if we can look at 140,
8		paragraph 140. Now, do we see at paragraph 140 you've
9		written here:
10		"From the information that I had at the time,
11		Sheku Bayoh was in possession of a knife for a very
12		short time prior to the altercation with the police on
13		Hayfield Road. The actions and use of force from what
14		I had established, from an early stage, led me to
15		conclude that the force used would be necessary and
16		proportionate to restrain Sheku and there was nothing
17		else to the contrary based on the information that
18		I had."
19		Now, given what you've just told the Inquiry, could
20		I ask you to reflect upon this, and in fact would it be
21		fairer to say that from the evidence that you've given
22		you ought not to have made a conclusion that the force
23		used would be necessary and proportionate?
24	Α.	I think the word "conclude" there is probably
25		inaccurate. The information I had at the material time

1 was that there was nothing to indicate that there was a disproportionate use of force, on the information 2 3 I had round about the earlier precursor incidents 4 leading up to that, with Mr Bayoh in possession of 5 a knife, acting erratically, three independent members of the public, the fact that he appears under the 6 7 influence at that stage as well, which is coming 8 independently. So this information I did have. 9 So what I didn't have was what --10 Q. The gap? -- what aspect of the restraint and the use of force 11 Α. 12 was. So that what I'm -- what I've put down there is 13 accurate, as the fact is that I was -- there was nothing 14 to indicate that it was disproportionate, the use of 15 force. I think the word "conclude" -- because what I have is what I have at that particular stage, but 16 17 that's not basically to say that that will not change as personal initial accounts, as more detailed statements, 18 19 as eyewitness accounts, as CCTV footage comes into the 20 investigation, but at that -- at that time, when I'm 21 basically dealing with the incident at Hayfield Road, 22 that's what I'm basically dealing with. 23

Q. So can I be clear that what you're saying is that "the actions and use of force from what I had established" in fact doesn't relate to the use of force, but it relates

24

25

- to the information you had before the police interact
 with him, namely where he was, what he was doing?
- A. So the response by the officers concerned, on their

 officer safety training and what would be deemed to be

 necessary and proportionate to deal with the threat

 posed to them at that particular time, on the basis of

 the information I had, there was nothing to say that

 that was disproportionate at that time. I don't know if
 - Q. I suppose the question is: did you have any evidence that it was proportionate?

that makes sense to you.

9

10

11

25

- 12 No, I didn't have evidence one way or other, but what --Α. 13 as I say, I didn't have anything at all around the fact 14 that it was disproportionate and the circumstances 15 indicating the spontaneous response of police officers to an incident that they could not have perceived what 16 17 they were going to basically face as they turned up, and at that particular time, and thereafter if you look at 18 19 the other side from the actions of Mr Bayoh as he 20 approaches Hayfield Road and thereafter the coming 21 together, what I had at that stage was there was nothing 22 to indicate, evidentially wise or through witness 23 statements, that there was any disproportionate use of force. But I do take your point around that. 24
 - Q. I mean, the question really for you is: in those

- 1 circumstances, was there any evidence you had in
- 2 relation to the force at all?
- A. No. Other than we had obviously recovered items

 within -- on Hayfield Road and the aftermath of that,

 obviously batons, CS had been recovered, and the knife

 had obviously been recovered as well.
- 7 Q. So you were able to ascertain that that had happened?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. But in relation to how many officers engaged with
 10 Sheku Bayoh, how long he was held down, in what way he
 11 was held down, whether or not that was done
 12 appropriately, you didn't have any of that information?
- 13 A. Other than the number of officers we knew that were at the scene.
- Q. And would you agree in those circumstances that what
 you've done is effectively assumed or presumed that what
 the officers had done was necessary and proportionate,
 rather than looked at the evidence and ascertained that
 it was necessary or proportionate?
- 20 A. So the evidence I had at the time was -- it was from my
 21 perception at that morning on 3 May -- was that I had
 22 details of the early movements of Mr Bayoh which led him
 23 to Hayfield Road, and the independent witnesses from the
 24 motorists whereby we have a male with a knife running at
 25 cars. So we had that information, I had that

1 information, just -- and obviously what I had thereafter was the officers coming out from the canteen muster area 2 of Kirkcaldy Police Office, reacting to a spontaneous 3 4 incident, and thereafter the coming together of Mr Bayoh 5 with the officers who thereafter restrained him. So from what I had -- and again I think we're 6 7 probably coming at this in different angles -- but it 8 was -- nothing could -- nothing I had indicated that it 9 was disproportionate regarding their response. It 10 wasn't premeditated, it was a spontaneous response to an incident which was developing at that time of the 11 12 morning in Kirkcaldy. Q. But you would agree that nothing you had either one way 13 14 or the other would allow you to say whether or not the 15 force used had been necessary and had been proportionate? 16 A. The identified actions of each individual officer I did 17 not know, and what force was used. 18 19 LORD BRACADALE: Mr Macleod, anything arising? 20 MR MACLEOD: No, thank you, sir. 21 LORD BRACADALE: Detective Chief Superintendent Campbell, 22 thank you very much for coming to give evidence to the Inquiry. We shall be raising in a moment for the day 23 and you will then be free to go. 24 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir. 25

```
(The witness withdrew)
 1
 2
         LORD BRACADALE: 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.
 3
        (4.22 pm)
                      (The hearing adjourned until 10 am
 4
 5
                         on Wednesday, 15 March 2023)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Τ	INDEX
2	PAGE
3	DETECTIVE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT1
4	PATRICK CAMPBELL (continued)
5	
6	Questions from MS GRAHAME (continued)1
7	
8	Rule 9 Application by MS MITCHELL165
9	
10	Questions from MS MITCHELL172
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	