1	Tuesday, 1	3 February 2024
2	2 (10.00 am)	
3	MR WILLIAM LITTLE (continued)	
4	Questions from MS GRAHAME (continu	ied)
5	LORD BRACADALE: Good morning Mr Little.	
6	Ms Grahame.	
7	MS GRAHAME: Thank you. On Friday we were ta	lking about
8	your decision to disclose the fact that k	lunt force
9	trauma had not been the cause of death.	
10	A. Yes.	
11	Q. And you spoke to us about your rationale	and we went
12	through the reasons that you had taken in	to account when
13	you made that decision. This was on your	Inquiry
14	statement SBPI 421 at paragraph 67 I thir	ık.
15	If we look at your response, you say	you are aware
16	your actions were unprecedented, and you	explain your
17	reasons and I think if we move up the page	ge, you set out
18	the various factors that you took into ac	count. I think
19	we went through those on Friday afternoor	1.
20	A. That is correct.	
21	Q. That is just to let you see what we had t	alked about.
22	Did you consider when you were making thi	s decision
23	whether taking a view telling the offi	cers about the
24	post mortem interim preliminary informati	on that you had
25	had from the pathologist and taking a vie	w on their

1 status was perhaps premature at that stage? I think as I explained on Friday, everything was kind of 2 Α. 3 unusual about this investigation, you know, the fact 4 that officers had not provided any statements, any 5 initial accounts, you know we later found out that the information that was passed to Keith Harrower was --6 7 a lot of it was inaccurate, yes. So, as I have said 8 there, it was unprecedented that I did this. Did you --9 Q. 10 Α. Sitting -- sorry, sitting here now I can understand 11 maybe saying it was maybe premature but I was trying to 12 weigh up of getting the statements from the officers, 13 this was causing untold harm to the investigation, and 14 ultimately it caused untold distress to the family. 15 I was hoping that if I could get statements when I met the family -- and I think originally at that time I was 16 17 hopeful we were going to meet the family on the 5th but it wasn't arranged until the 6th -- I could say, "We've 18 19 got the statements, I have just had a phone call, the 20 statements are in", and that would have been a huge step 21 forward, it would have been a very positive step in respect of the investigation, and would have been 22 a very, very positive step in respect of our 23 24 relationship with the family.

So, yes, I know we are sitting in hindsight here,

25

1 I say to you I have never done it prior to this, I have never done it since then, but I was trying to break 2 3 a deadlock here and unfortunately that deadlock 4 continued. And actually what I think the disappointing 5 thing is, I later became aware the information I was passed by Detective Superintendent Campbell that the 6 7 officers would be spoken that that night, my 8 understanding is they were not spoken to that night and 9 that is disappointing, you know. And that is my 10 understanding, they were not spoken to that night by the 11 police. 12 Q. You have been advised of that, have you? 13 Yes. Yes. I recall that the information I received Α. 14 later was they hadn't been spoken to that night by 15 Mr McEwan. So me taking that step --Who told you that? 16 Q. -- me kind of making that decision, what I thought for 17 Α. 18 the best intentions is was it actually taken forward by another step, you know. 19 Who told you that? 20 Q. That was -- that was -- that was when we met with 21 Α. 22 Keith Hardie, on the 6th after we met with the family. 23 I was hopeful then that we would be going and there would actually be some of the statements there, 24 something there, because that is the 4th and then we get 25

1		to the 6th, how long would it take them to prepare
2		an operational statement?
3	Q.	So on the 6th you were advised by Keith Hardie that in
4		fact the officers hadn't been told
5	Α.	My understanding is they hadn't been spoken to that
6		night.
7	Q.	We have heard other evidence that they had been told,
8		and in fact Conrad Trickett described a conversation he
9		had Jane Combe regarding the disclosure to the officers.
10		You don't know anything about that?
11	Α.	No. No, I am not aware of that.
12	Q.	Did you have any concerns in relation to making this
13		decision whether sharing this information could have
14		an impact on the officers' own recollection of events?
15	Α.	No, I don't think so. I think it was important to to
16		capture their recollection of events as soon as
17		possible. There is the PIP process, yes, you know, and
18		the methodology and the rationale why that PIP process
19		is you know, I know the timescales, but how they
20		arrived at these timescales when the PIP was designed,
21		I don't know. But what I would say is in my experience
22		the longer you leave it until you take a statement off
23		somebody is their perception of what happens can change.
24	Q.	We have heard evidence that when they are if people
25		are given further information that could potentially

1		impact their recollection. It could it could perhaps
2		change things that they thought were the case. And that
3		that is a risk, if you do not capture that initial
4		account or basic account or their own recollections.
5	A.	Yes.
6	Q.	Do you agree with that?
7	A.	I go back it was the information they got was
8		that I put forward was very, very limited. It was
9		unascertained pending toxicology and further examination
10		and I had asked the question: was blunt-force trauma,
11		you know, responsible? And I was told no. So the
12		information is very, very limited. It is not as if it
13		is like when the full post mortem report came out and
14		you are providing that information in respect to that.
15		There was no details passed to Police Scotland although
16		Police Scotland knew of the injuries that were
17		identified on Mr Bayoh's body.
18	Q.	So the fact that you were giving what you considered to
19		be limited information
20	A.	It was limited.
21	Q.	was that also a factor in your decision-making
22		process?
23	A.	Yes, yes.
24	Q.	Did you consider whether it would be potentially
25		perceived, say by the family or members of the public,

1 that the police were being given preferential treatment 2 by being given information about the post mortem? 3 Well, yes. I can see that because, as I have said to Α. 4 you, it is not something I did previously, it is not 5 something I did since. I am not aware of it happening since, you know within my organisation we've did that. 6 7 Yes, I can understand but I stand by -- the whole 8 objective here was to get statements off these officers because it was hindering, and it was hindering in a way 9 10 because we didn't have basic facts. I am aware that Mr Trickett says he didn't get the basic facts because 11 12 the basic facts were known. Well, they weren't known 13 because the information that Keith Harrower passed, particularly information on the briefing paper, we now 14 15 know now that is inaccurate and we knew, as we built the evidence, that that was inaccurate. 16

So they didn't know the basic facts. We didn't have 17 18 initial accounts. So here we are, I'm on day 2 here, 19 I've just taken over and we have to find -- I could see 20 a blockage right away and I could see the problems that 21 were coming down the line, for want of a better 22 expression, yes, so I made this decision. I have never 23 hidden this decision. I have never hidden it. This is what I did, you know. You know, so it wasn't as if it 24 was something I did and then I -- you know, you know, 25

1		everybody within my organisation was aware, Crown were
2		aware that I did this. Nobody passed adverse comment to
3		me about having done it.
4	Q.	How were the Crown aware?
5	Α.	My recollection is that well, first of all it was in
6		my statement that I submitted when we submitted the
7		first report so I think the statement I can't
8		remember the date, is it July I prepared the statement?
9		I think it and that and I had prepared a briefing
10		paper after day 7 in respect of where we were.
11	Q.	So the Crown were aware retrospectively, after
12	A.	Oh, yes. Oh, they weren't aware I was going to make
13		that decision, no.
14	Q.	No.
15	A.	No, no. Sorry, I don't want to give that impression.
16		They were not aware that you know, that was
17		a decision I made that night to do that.
18	Q.	I see. To go back for a moment to the idea of
19		a perception perhaps of preferential treatment to the
20		officers, did you consider whether that perception,
21		which you have acknowledged could have been created, had
22		any impact on the trust in your investigation, the faith
23		in your investigation?
24	A.	Did
25	Q.	In it being independent?

1 Α. Sitting here nearly nine years later I cannot recall if 2 that was a consideration I made at that time. All right. 3 Q. 4 Okay, I considered my rationale for making that Α. 5 decision, or why I was going to make that decision if there was an indication there was no statements 6 7 forthcoming when we sat down with Mr Campbell. My 8 consideration with regard to the family was I was 9 hopeful, I was hopeful, that we would get statements so 10 I would be able to, when I sat with the family, say: the matter of the statements has been resolved and is 11 12 overcome and we are getting the statements, or we have 13 the statements. Q. You've talked about the decision being unprecedented in 14 15 your role in PIRC, either before or after May 2015? 16 Α. Yes. You obviously had a lot of prior experience as a police 17 Q. 18 officer. Had you been involved in any situations where 19 you had disclosed preliminary post mortem findings to 20 potential eyewitnesses? 21 Α. Not that I recall, no. We have focused so far on blunt-force trauma. 22 Q. 23 Yes. Α. Q. And that was not a cause of death. Did you consider 24 25 other possible causes of death as part of the

1		significance of those towards your investigation,
2		for example positional asphyxia, did you consider
3		whether that could be a cause of death?
4	Α.	Well, that cause of death would be identified kind of
5		later through the kind of pathology and the expert
6		witness kind of process that was adopted.
7	Q.	The same I suppose would apply to mechanical asphyxia?
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	What about the restraint itself, did you consider
10		whether the restraint of itself could be a potential
11		cause of death resulting in cardiac arrest?
12	Α.	At that time we didn't know because it was unascertained
13		pending, you know, toxicology and further examination,
14		and that would be further examination down the line.
15	Q.	Did you discuss those at all with or the possibility
16		of those with the pathologist after the post mortem?
17	Α.	Not that I recall, no.
18	Q.	Did you consider whether those potential causes would
19		impact on the status of the officers?
20	Α.	Oh, they well, if it came to pass that that was the
21		primary or the sole reason for Mr Bayoh's demise then
22		yes, the status of the officers would be something that
23		would be under consideration.
24	Q.	If the ultimate findings had been that restraint
25		contributed or caused death or positional or mechanical

1 asphyxia had contributed or caused death, what impact would that have had on the officers' status? 2 That would need to have been -- I would suggest given 3 Α. 4 the time that would maybe have come through from the 5 pathology, you know the further tests that were done, is 6 their status may have changed. And the reason I do that 7 is, maybe as we discussed on Friday is police officers 8 are unique in society as they are allowed to use force, 9 they are legitimately allowed to use force and even 10 lethal force. So it then becomes what was their justification for it, what was their rationale what 11 12 was -- you know the factors there. Yes. But when 13 I made that decision that was not known. As I said, it 14 was very limited information that I passed. Very, very 15 limited. Did you consider that if one of those potential causes 16 Q.

17 of death did turn out to be the final result of the post mortem, and you had taken the decision to share 18 some interim results with the officers, did you consider 19 20 at that time what would happen in the future to the 21 status of the officers or how it would look to the public that you have shared information about 22 23 preliminary results with them? A. No, no, I didn't, no. I have to -- you know. 24 No 25 I don't recall that, no.

1 Q. We touched on the timing of the information about the 2 post mortem being shared with the family on Friday. 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. I would like to go back to that. I think the relevant 5 paragraph is 62 of your Inquiry statement, which is on the screen. You refer back to your first Inquiry 6 7 statement SBPI 00255, and you say: 8 "... 'I can't recall when the family were advised of the result of the post mortem. However, the information 9 10 may have been delivered via the FLOs and if so would be recorded into the FLO log'." 11 12 Α. Yes. I think on Friday afternoon you said thought the family 13 Q. 14 had been told by Aamer Anwar, their solicitor? 15 Α. That is correct, yes. Or Mr Lewis, the FLO? 16 Q. That is correct, yes. 17 Α. 18 Q. We have heard some evidence that the family were not 19 told and did not know about the post mortem until the 20 next day. If you had known that the family had not been 21 told, either by Mr Anwar or by Mr Lewis, about the 22 post mortem, would that have altered your decision to authorise disclosure of the PM results to the officers? 23 A. Potentially, yes. Because I was -- I made this decision 24 25 based on the fact that I had had a discussion with

18

1 Alistair Lewis, I had advised Alistair of the interim 2 result, that Ms Shearer had, you know, relayed to 3 myself, and he had -- I knew he had the meeting with the 4 family and he was going to advise Aamer Anwar. Now, the 5 next day he told me that he had advised Mr Anwar. If I go back to the -- when my first -- my first statement 6 7 to the Inquiry, where I said I couldn't recall. Just 8 for clarification in that matter, when I said it would 9 be in the FLO log is I did that statement sitting in my 10 house with access to no paperwork, so I was running off memory, and that is why I said, you know, the details 11 12 will be in the FLO log. Right. We have heard something from Mr Lewis about this 13 Q. 14 as well. If a situation had arisen that the family were 15 not told about the results of the post -- or the preliminary results of the post mortem until after the 16 17 officers, sitting here now on reflection do you have any

A. If that is -- if that is what has happened, bearing in
mind my understanding of what has happened is Mr Anwar
was made aware, and obviously Alistair and John Clerkin
were meeting with the family earlier that night.
In fact, when I was sitting with Pat Campbell there was
a good chance they were still sitting with the family.
Yes, I would be uncomfortable with that.

comment to make about that possible scenario?

1 Q. Why? 2 Because it is only right and respectful that the family Α. 3 are made aware before anybody else is. But I have to 4 also -- I have to also say Police Scotland knew the 5 result of the post mortem. Police Scotland --Q. I think you mentioned on Friday that was because 6 7 officers had been present during the post mortem. 8 They were there, yes. Α. 9 You told us on Friday about the meeting you had had at Q. 10 Kirkcaldy Police Office --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- with Campbell and Hardie and was it Wilson? 13 I think it was Stuart Wilson, yes. Α. 14 Where you discussed this possibility of disclosure to Q. 15 the officers. 16 Α. Yes. Did anyone at that meeting suggest or say, "If you are 17 Q. going to advise officers, we had better make sure the 18 19 family are told first"? 20 No, no. Α. 21 Q. Did you consider confirming, either via Mr Anwar or with 22 Mr Lewis, that the family had actually been told first? No, I didn't because I was working on -- and it is 23 Α. 24 an assumption, that they would be told. Right. You talked to us on -- well, on Friday afternoon 25 Q.

1 and today you have talked about your expectation that 2 you would get the statements pretty much the next day? 3 Α. Yes. 4 I think is that fair to say? With that expectation in Q. 5 mind, had you prepared a witness interview strategy for the next day or started to --6 7 Α. No, no. 8 Q. So if the officers had said the following day, "We've 9 heard about the post mortem, we are going to give you 10 statements", what would your plan have been at that time about obtaining the statements from the officers? 11 12 Well, at that time I would have expected the officers to Α. 13 submit their own statement, as would be invariably the 14 normal process through the PIP process. There is the 15 basic facts which the PIM would get, just the initial accounts which the officers would either in the main 16 17 write themselves or sometimes you have a PIM will write it for them. But if you have a number of police 18 19 officers, it is normally they would write it themselves 20 and then there is what you call the stage four aspect 21 where within 48 hours the police officers invariably 22 supply their own statements or write their own 23 statements.

It is very, very rare that we would -- that we would put a team to take a statement off them at that time.

25

1 And I would expect them to write their own statement, 2 what may be referred to as an operational statement, and 3 we would get that statement, we would be able to examine 4 it and then in due course we would invariably go back to 5 the officers once we have gathered in more 6 information -- you know, we talked about on Friday the Airwave, the STORMs -- and maybe go back and get more 7 8 detailed statements off them. So it wasn't a case of 9 thinking: oh, I'd better have an interview strategy 10 ready for each of the nine officers, I would expect them to have supplied an operational statement. 11 12 Q. I think on Friday talked about the possibility of having 13 a statement taken from an investigator with PIRC, or 14 preparing a self-penned or written statement themselves? 15 Α. Yes. Am I clear in understanding that actually you would have 16 Q. expected on the 5th a sort of self-penned or operational 17 statements from the officers? 18 19 Yes, I would have. Α. What would you have suspected in terms of your PIRC 20 Q. 21 investigation after you received self-penned statements; 22 would there have been a planned interview at some stage with PIRC? 23 Yes, depending -- depending on what the investigation 24 Α.

had identified and what evidence we had in gathered over

1		the period of time. But, you know, in these
2		circumstances I cannot envisage that we wouldn't be
3		going back to the principal officers, if you call them
4		principal officers, but I expect an operational
5		statement from each of them, yes.
6	Q.	Can I ask you for your comment we have heard evidence
7		from Pat Campbell and Keith Hardie, I asked questions of
8		them in relation to this disclosure
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	of the PM results, the interim results. Keith Hardie
11		gave evidence on 15 March last year, he was taken to the
12		Gold Group meeting minutes, do you remember the ones
13		I showed you for the 12.30 meeting on 4th May?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	Where there was a task and asking about the issue of
16		disclosure, and I asked him.
17		"Question: Do you remember any discussion about
18		disclosing post mortem results to the officers?"
19		He said he didn't, and he says:
20		"Answer: I am pretty confident I was never
21		involved in any discussion in relation to that."
22		So he doesn't have any recollection of a meeting
23		with you on 4 May in relation to a disclosure. Can you
24		provide any explanation for that?
25	Α.	No, I can't provide any explanation for that.

23

24

25

1 Q. Are you confident that you did have that meeting in Kirkcaldy on 4 May? 2 Absolutely. Absolutely. 3 Α. 4 Q. Then we spoke to Campbell and took his evidence on 5 14 March last year. Again, we asked him about this issue in relation to disclosure and the task, and asked 6 7 him if -- in relation to his involvement. He says: 8 "Answer: Garry McEwan raised the matter~..." 9 At the Gold Group meeting: 10 "Answer: ... There was a detailed discussion, the main representative from PIRC was Billy Little. The 11 12 discussion was around we would deploy PIRC FLOs to 13 deliver the results of the PM to the family. The second 14 aspect was Garry McEwan thought it would be beneficial 15 in their status as witnesses for their welfare and wellbeing for them to be told about the results of the 16 17 post mortem." 18 Sorry, I am reading that out. It doesn't really --19 grammatically maybe it doesn't make a lot of sense but 20 there was a discussion with Garry McEwan, that they 21 would maybe deploy PIRC FLOs to deliver the results of 22 the post mortem to the family and the second aspect was

Garry McEwan thought it would be beneficial in relation

to their status as witnesses, and for welfare and

wellbeing, for them to know the results of the

1		post mortem. Do you remember any discussion in relation
2		to that or being advised by Pat Campbell that
3		Garry McEwan had been discussing it?
4	Α.	First of all, I have maybe picked you up a wee bit wrong
5		there, Ms Grahame. Is that an inference then that I was
6		at that Gold Group meeting?
7	Q.	No, I think you have already said, and others have said,
8		you weren't at that Gold Group meeting.
9	Α.	No, I wasn't, no.
10	Q.	But this was Pat Campbell's understanding of the
11		situation regarding the conversation about disclosure.
12	Α.	Right. Okay.
13	Q.	Did he raise any of that at the meeting
14	Α.	No.
15	Q.	you say he attended?
16	Α.	No, no. The first I became aware that there was any
17		prior discussion about disclosure to the principal
18		officers was when I read those Gold Group meetings,
19		and I what day that was but it was whenever we
20		received the Gold Group meetings or took possession of
21		the Gold Group meetings, okay. I was not aware as
22		far as I was concerned in relation to the disclosure of
23		this information, that was a decision I was making based
24		on the rationale that I have provided, I was totally
25		unaware and I am actually quite surprised, and

1		I think I expressed that surprise on Friday, when
2		I looked at the Gold Group meetings that that
3		actually was being discussed because and I will take
4		you back to what I have said a couple of times is I have
5		never known this to occur. I have never known. But
6		I felt given the circumstances that we had, that
7		I thought it was the best way to break the stalemate.
8		Ultimately it didn't, but
9	Q.	Ultimately you did get a final report from the
10		pathologist.
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	And we have heard evidence from Kerryanne Shearer in
13		relation to this. She was the pathologist. And that
14		final report we have heard was dated 18 June 2015.
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	So this was after you had the statements from the
17		officers?
18	A.	Yes, that is correct.
19	Q.	You got them on the 4th. The cause of death Dr Shearer
20		gave evidence about on 9 May last year, that it was
21		sudden death in a man intoxicated by MDMA which was
22		ecstasy and alpha-PVP whilst being restrained. And
23		in evidence Dr Shearer said that would now include, "And
24		the struggle against the restraint", not just the
25		restraint itself. If you had not disclosed the interim

1 results to the officers and you had delayed until after you got final report, which would have been 18 June --2 3 so after the initial statements, after you got the final 4 report -- would that have altered your view about the 5 status of the officers? 6 I go back to -- when you asked me just a short time ago, Α. 7 I said it -- it would have -- it would have made me 8 think more about the status of the officers, if I can 9 put that, okay. So if I say -- on the 4th there was no 10 evidence to suggest that they were -- they were responsible in any way for a criminal act. So they were 11 12 not suspects. They were not suspects at that time. 13 When -- when, you know, the final report come out is 14 yes you have the cause of death and it was comma "whilst 15 being restrained". But I think also Ms Shearer, if 16 remember right from the reading of that post mortem 17 report, and it may well be -- and I'm sitting here just 18 now, my recollection is she could not determine how much 19 the restraint had on the cause of death. So it wasn't 20 like Ms Shearer was saying the restraint was the primary 21 cause of death, or how much the restraint had played in 22 the death.

23 So that then became -- became how do we take this 24 forward. So we've got MDMA, we know quite a lot about 25 MDMA in this country. Alpha-PVP we knew nothing about.

1 My recollection is at that time when we did some research on alpha-PVP there had been one seizure of 2 3 alpha-P and it was at a festival or something like that. 4 So we knew nothing about alpha-PVP, so the discussion 5 was right, how do we find out about alpha-PVP. And the restraint -- then we need to look at the restraint and 6 7 have identified experts in the area around about 8 restraint to give us some opinion in respect of the part 9 that restraint played in that man's death. 10 So I wouldn't -- just because we got that report I wouldn't immediately have said, "Well, they are 11 12 suspects now, aren't they?" Okay? Because we've got no definitive that a crime has occurred here. 13 14 Did you have a discussion with Dr Shearer about the Q. 15 contribution that restraint had had in the cause of death? 16 17 No, I don't think I did actually. I think at first --Α. it wasn't like I was having regular discussions with 18 Ms Shearer in respect of this. I think ... my 19 20 recollection is that I made Ms Shearer aware or 21 Ms Shearer became aware that there was expert witness 22 testimony being sought because we needed to obtain some samples and Crown gave authority that the samples be 23 24 released to us, as an organisation, you know, so they 25 could be taken to the different experts for examination,

1		the histology samples that she had possession of.
2	Q.	Just to be clear about this, Dr Shearer gave evidence
3		that the initial post mortem was pending toxicology and
4		further investigations.
5	A.	Yes.
6	Q.	The final report was after those results had been
7		obtained, so that was 18 June. Was it your
8		understanding that she was seeking further expert
9		opinion?
10	A.	I maybe getting
11	Q.	Or was it the Crown at that stage or $\ldots$ or was it PIRC?
12	A.	The Crown issued the instruction about the expert
13		witnesses, the exact date of it I would need to refresh
14		myself from, you know
15	Q.	I think the final report was dated 18 June. The final
16		post mortem report. That was after Dr Shearer, as
17		I understand her evidence, had completed the toxicology
18		and the further investigations.
19	A.	Right. Okay, yes. But there then became the
20		instructions from Crown in respect of identifying the
21		experts who could provide expert testimony in respect of
22		the alpha-PVP and the restraint, because that came
23		later.
24	Q.	Was it your understanding then that that issue still had
25		to be resolved in some way through expert opinion

- 1 evidence?
- 2 A. Yes, yes.
- Q. And perhaps with assistance from the Crown -- and we might hear about this later -- and with the involvement of PIRC in instructing experts, that was done, that line of investigation was followed?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. But did you consider at that time, after you got the
  final post mortem report, the impact of something we
  have heard about in evidence called material
- 11 contribution? Have you heard of that?
- 12 A. No, I haven't, no.
- Q. Can I move on, please, and ask you about the paperwork that surrounds this decision that you made in relation to disclosure. I think you have a hard copy of your notebook. We looked at that on Friday. I hope you still have that, it's PIRC 04200.
- 18 A. Thank you.

19 Q. I really just want to confirm that I have not missed 20 anything in your notebook. What, if anything, did you 21 note in your notebook on 4 May that related to this 22 decision to make a disclosure to the officers? 23 (Pause).

I couldn't find anything but I wanted you to checkyour own writing.

1	Α.	No, that is fine. There is no details in respect of
2		that disclosure apart from, I think it's item 5 I have
3		got:
4		"Witness statements from all officers and staff."
5		And I have got:
6		"9 officers."
7		And then I have:
8		"Admin Detective Superintendent Campbell~"
9	Q.	What page are you on?
10	Α.	It says 47 at the top.
11	Q.	47 is the
12	Α.	Sorry, scroll back, sorry. There.
13	Q.	I think maybe page 3. We are talking about 4 May and
14		I think we see that at the bottom of page 2 on the
15		left-hand column, we see 4 May.
16	Α.	Sorry, 47 is the reference number of that book, every
17		page is marked 47.
18	Q.	At the bottom on the left-hand side we see Monday
19		4 May 2015, so this is the section where you are dealing
20		in your notebook with the 4 May.
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	It goes on to the next page, page 3, and then on page $4$
23		on the left-hand column we can see at the bottom
24		Tuesday, 5 May.
25	Α.	Yes.

1	Q.	So if there was an entry about this decision it would be
2		on one of those pages?
3	A.	It would, yes. So we've got if you look at the
4		first the left-hand page and you've got number 4 and
5		number 5, just coming down.
6	Q.	Is that?
7	A.	On the left-hand side.
8	Q.	Page 2 or page 3? Let's go back to page 2. We see on
9		the left-hand side at the bottom it says 4 May, do you
10		see that there? So is it that page you are referring
11		to?
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	That is page 2.
14	A.	Yes. Okay, so if you go to the next page.
15	Q.	Page 3.
16	A.	If you look at the top okay, so okay, if you
17		then go to the next page.
18	Q.	Page 4.
19	A.	So, sorry, so if you stop, the left-hand obviously
20		pages are kind of double, so the left-hand page if you
21		look at the points and there's 4 and then 5.
22	Q.	Yes.
23	A.	You've got 5:
24		"Witness statements from all officers and staff."
25		So this is me agreeing with Mr Campbell what is

1		required. Then I have got:
2		"9 officers. Advised
3		[Detective Superintendent]~"
4		Sorry, it's:
5		" D/Supt Campbell that status following PM was
6		witnesses and they could be advised of interim PM
7		result."
8		And then I've got:
9		"C/Supt McEwan attending office and will personally
10		contact each officer and ask for statements."
11	Q.	Thank you. So that is the area where you note the
12		discussion that took place?
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	That does mention Chief Superintendent McEwan as the
15		person that is going to be providing that disclosure to
16		the officers personally?
17	Α.	Yes, that's correct.
18	Q.	So that ties in with what Pat Campbell said in evidence.
19		Is that following on from the meeting that you had
20		in Kirkcaldy Police Office with Campbell, Hardie, and
21		Wilson?
22	Α.	Yes, because the next line is 20.55 I left Kirkcaldy.
23	Q.	Thank you. Then can we look at your daybook, 04520.
24		I think the relevant page is page 9. There is
25		a reference to a meeting there, 20.05. If we can move

1		further down the page we will see the time there it is.
1		further down the page we will see the time, there it is:
2		"Meeting with Pat Campbell."
3		And it was was this a note in your daybook about
4		that meeting?
5	A.	It is, yes.
6	Q.	Can you help us understand the notes that relate to this
7		discussion or this decision.
8	Α.	Yes, well I have got scribbled notes there. I've got.
9		"O/S Action.
10		"1. Gold Group terms of reference.
11		"2. Movements confirmed.
12		"3. CCTV strategy - scope done by P/Scotland.
13		"4. H2H [house-to-house] strategy."
14		And then I have got a couple of dashes and:
15		" Gordon Stanford!"
16		I have got:
17		"5. Officers' clothing.
18		"6. CS spray (PAVA).
19		"7. Nothing forensic from locus."
20		And then I've got
21	Q.	Can we move up the page there because there is some
22		more
23	A.	Then I have got:
24		"Confirmed officers' status as witnesses!"
25		If you go to the next

1	Q.	And was that part of the discussion that you had?
2	A.	Yes. If you go to the next stage.
3	Q.	On to page 10.
4	A.	I have got:
5		"07.10AM.
6		"Telecoms."
7	Q.	What was that in connection with?
8	A.	I have got scribbling kind of circled. It's:
9		"Mobiles.
10		"2 T/calls~"
11	Q.	Is any of that in connection with this decision?
12	A.	No, no, no. And then we come down to the next bit:
13		"Commander will be coming in to [telephone] T/call
14		each of the officers of their status."
15	Q.	I think on Friday you told us the commander was McEwan?
16	A.	That is correct.
17	Q.	So that was the following morning at 7.10?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	Was that when that entry was made?
20	A.	Yes. So if we continue on as well, if you scroll up,
21		I've noted:
22		"Keith Hardie [DCI] MIT East."
23		Because I said to you I didn't know who Keith Hardie
24		was.
25	Q.	But you knew that he had been at the post mortem and he

1		had been at the meeting?
2	A.	Yes, yes, yes. But I was unsure so yes. Then I've
3		got:
4		"FLO.
5		"1. Death message.
6		"2. Read out statement from Pat Campbell.
7		"Garry McEwan."
8		I was trying to understand, that was in respect of
9		what had happened in respect of the delivery of the
10		death message. Then again I've got:
11		"3. Garry McEwan."
12		I've got:
13		"Social media.
14		"Background to victim."
15		And then
16	Q.	Is any of that related to the disclosure?
17	Α.	No, no, the disclosure is the point about the commander
18		will be coming in to telephone each of the yes, and
19		obviously
20	Q.	And the previous page?
21	Α.	"Confirm officers states as witnesses", so it was
22		discussed at that meeting.
23	Q.	Thank you. Then on the policy log, we heard about that
24		on Friday, you said John McSporran was the author of
25		that policy log?

1 A. That is correct, yes.

2	Q.	And it was started on 5 May. Can we look at PIRC 04153.
3		Item 1, for example, just to remind us of this document.
4		It says: decision number, the decision itself, the
5		reason for the decision, the officer making the
6		decision, and it gives the date.
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	If we could look at so can we look at I appreciate
9		this policy log commenced on 5 May but I think you told
10		us on Friday you had discussed entries with Mr McSporran
11		at different times.
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	I am interested in item 9, so this is an entry
14		John McSporran made on 7 May, or appears to be, and it
15		talks about the post mortem examination. We know that
16		took place on 4 May, the day before John McSporran
17		started the log but he has obviously recorded this here.
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	I am interested in this entry. Was this completed with
20		some guidance from yourself to Mr McSporran?
21	Α.	I can't recall, sorry.
22	Q.	All right.
23	Α.	I obviously prepared a kind of note on what had happened
24		at the post mortem, whether John used that or whether he
25		had that information~ because I would have briefed

1		him when he came on duty on 5th on what had taken place.
2	Q.	There is no mention there of any decision in relation to
3		the
4	Α.	No.
5	Q.	No mention of blunt head trauma not being the cause of
6		death. Do you remember if you gave that information to
7		Mr McSporran or not?
8	A.	I think I would have been. I think as I said, as I said
9		earlier, I have never hidden the fact that, you know,
10		I did disclose to Police Scotland and asked you know,
11		said they could tell the officers that, so
12	Q.	All right. Thank you. But there are references in both
13		your daybook
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	and your notebook
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	that relate to this. They were prepared shortly
18		after the discussion or at the time of the discussion?
19	Α.	The notes from my daybook, I would suggest they were
20		made at the time of discussion. And then I would
21		have later, at an available time I would have made an
22		entry into my notebook which is the normal book, as you
23		are aware, that you would produce when you were at
24		
		court, if you were involved in court proceedings.

1		can I ask you about your second Inquiry statement,
2		paragraph 73. That is the 421. So you realised you
3		weren't getting statements?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	We will get this up on the screen in a moment. It's
6		paragraph 73. I think when you were giving your
7		statement you were asked whether you had considered
8		speaking to the officers direct yourself to tell them
9		about their status
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	and to make a direct request to them to give
12		statements. I think here you say:
13		"In hindsight I believe that exactly what I should
14		have done and it is something I always do now when in
15		attendance at an out-of-hours incident or
16		a post-incident procedure. But up until this point the
17		request for a statement from a police officer or
18		a member of police staff had always been requested via
19		Police Scotland and this had presented no challenges
20		previously."
21	Α.	That is correct.
22	Q.	Can you tell us a little bit more about this? You
23		obviously in hindsight you think that is exactly what
24		you should have done, was there anything stopping you
25		doing that other than normal procedure is you didn't?

A. First of all, I wasn't there on the 3rd when all the
 officers were present.

3 Q. No, no. But on 4 May?

4 Α. So on the 4th, you know when I became aware of the --5 bearing in mind I became aware about 8 o'clock at night that we still didn't have statements is I would have 6 7 need to have found out the officers' home addresses, and 8 gone around the home addresses -- gone round the home 9 addresses of the police officers, which is not something 10 I have ever done before. I have always arranged to see them, you know, within a police office. 11

But I think the fact is -- is on the 3rd we didn't speak to the officers. On the 4th I didn't speak to the officers. We later, and you most likely -- I would imagine you will come on to it, we asked Police Scotland to undertake that task. And that is what had happened previously, communication had all been done through Police Scotland.

I talked on Friday about serving the letter of instruction, for want of a better expression, to be served on the police, and within that would be operational statements from all officers involved in this incident or we would identify the officers. That is how we went about our business and was that what was agreed with Police Scotland what would happen then.

1 This obviously caused a conundrum. It caused 2 a concern: what if this happens? Because I don't think 3 we have overcame what will happen if a police officer 4 says, "I am not giving you a statement". So to ensure 5 that there is no ambiguity in our minds -- and I am now 6 just speaking generally here -- as I think it is best 7 that actually if I am at an out-of-hours incident and 8 I'm at a PIM, I will ask to speak to the police 9 officers. The way the PIP process is designed, I have 10 to ask the PIM manager if I can speak to the police officers, all right. We have never been refused to 11 12 speak -- I don't know what would happen if we ever were 13 refused. That would then become a bit of a -- because 14 the PIP is for welfare and to aid the investigation and 15 I would go in and I would explain to the officers, I would explain who I am, what instruction I am working 16 17 under, okay, and I would say to them, "You are witnesses 18 to this incident, I need statements from you, is there any issue with us getting a statement from you?" 19

20 Now, I am hoping by that time we've got basic facts, 21 we've got initial accounts and then there will be 22 arrangements made within 48 hours for statements to 23 either -- for them to write their own statements or type 24 their own statements, or be -- I will supply teams to 25 take the statements. That is -- so there is no

1		ambiguity what we're asking of them and what their
2		status is and what legislation we are working under.
3		But what I feel at that time is we never spoke to these
4		officers. It is maybe something you will come on to
5		later about that.
6	Q.	You mentioned you would have had to have gone to their
7		home address.
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	This was on the 4th, when you became involved as lead
10		investigator?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	When would you have done that, if you had been taking
13		that direct action?
14	A.	But I wouldn't but I wasn't taken that direct action.
15	Q.	You weren't. But if you had, would you have done that
16		on the 4th or would you have done it later?
17	A.	No, I wouldn't have done it on the 4th because so
18		I am getting this information after 8 o'clock at night,
19		how many staff have I still got on that the time of
20		night? I don't know. I've been away at the
21		post mortem, I've then gone to Kirkcaldy, I've sat with
22		Pat Campbell, you know. So the actual mechanics and the
23		availability of people to go and do that, I don't think
24		I would have had that at that time, so it wouldn't have
25		been done that night.

1 Q. When would you have --

2 If I had taken that approach, if I had taken --Α. If you had taken that approach, when would you have had 3 Q. 4 the manpower or the resources to make that direct 5 contact with officers? If that was line and I didn't -- that wasn't the line 6 Α. 7 I took but talking in hindsight here and hypothetically, 8 then the earliest it would have been would have been the 9 5th, if the officers were available on the 5th and if 10 the officers agreed. Looking at the situation now if you have a scenario in 11 Q. 12 the future where officers decline to provide statements, 13 for whatever reason, seeking legal advice or otherwise, 14 or you have a situation where the post-incident manager 15 refuses permission for PIRC to speak to the officers, is there any way you -- or any further powers you would 16 17 like to be able to try and have that direct contact? 18 And do you think that would help? 19 I said earlier about this unique position that police Α. 20 officers have, you know in the fact of being able to use 21 force but the way -- the way I see the law and the way 22 the legislation is written in respect of a Crown 23 investigation, if they -- if they are witnesses, I can't force a witness to give me a statement. Now I know from 24 my liaison with the IOPC and the IPCC, they do have the 25

1 power to require an officer to attend. So they have that power, but the officers just stare at them. They 2 3 don't give information. That is the feedback that 4 I have had when I have had discussions with my 5 counterparts in the IPCC. So this is -- if they are witness, if it is 6 7 considered this is a criminal investigation -- bearing 8 in mind it was a death investigation -- but if it is 9 considered a criminal investigation, we can't force 10 a witness to give a statement. We can't force it. 11 Are there any circumstances where you can force Q. 12 a witness to give a statement? No. No, there is none. And at that time I could -- if 13 Α. 14 I considered them to have been suspects, I could have 15 detained the officers. But they are afforded all the rights of a -- it is now an arrest as we know, but 16 17 I could have -- if I had considered that, that the status was that of suspects, I could have detained them. 18 19 But you still couldn't force them to give a statement if Q. 20 they had been detained and were suspects? 21 Α. No, I would interview them under audio-visual conditions 22 and they would just say, "No comment", or just not 23 comment. Q. We have heard about the different statutory authorities 24 25 where you can have a Crown-led discretion, so direction

1		from the Crown to PIRC, as was this case.
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	Or you can have a Chief Constable-led or instructed
4		instruction?
5	A.	Yes.
6	Q.	My understanding is the powers of PIRC are different
7		under each of those scenarios?
8	Α.	Yes, they are.
9	Q.	There may be further powers available if it is
10		Chief Constable
11	A.	That is correct.
12	Q.	directed. Now, if it was a Chief Constable and
13		direction, would that afford PIRC further powers that
14		would allow you to demand statements from officers?
15	A.	Well, we can require under legislation but would they
16		give the statement? That becomes the conundrum.
17	Q.	So you can require the Chief Constable to provide those
18		statements
19	A.	Provide the information. The information we want is a
20		statement from their employee.
21	Q.	But again, that could be, "I am not saying anything"?
22	A.	Yes, so how do I don't know how you overcome this.
23		A duty of candour, given the privileged position they
24		are in, but how do you actually get that from them?
25	Q.	Do you have any ideas?

1 Α. No, I don't. I have to be honest with you, I don't. 2 Thank you. Can I ask you about an aspect of Q. 3 communication between the police and PIRC. 4 Α. Yes. 5 Roughly in that period, the day prior to you coming on, Q. 6 the day of 4 May, you were asked about this in relation 7 to a statement Garry McEwan had given, and he spoke 8 about this in evidence, that the family had requested to 9 Mr McEwan, Garry McEwan, an opportunity to lay flowers 10 at Hayfield Road where Mr Bayoh had been restrained. I think you indicate that you were asked about that. 11 12 Did you know that the family had made that request to 13 Garry McEwan? No, I've not recollection of that. I have no 14 Α. 15 recollection. How was that ... was that communicated to 16 me in some format? Garry McEwan does not specify, as far as I am aware --17 Q. 18 I will be corrected if I am wrong -- that he advised you 19 of that matter. If you had been aware of that, is that 20 something you could have facilitated as lead 21 investigator? 22 Absolutely, absolutely. Α. Is that something that PIRC have facilitated in the 23 Q. 24 past --25 Α. Yes, we have.

1	Q.	with other members of families?
2	Α.	Yes, I have other death investigations that have
3		occurred outside and we have facilitated that.
4	Q.	Thank you. Can I ask you about when this is after
5		the post mortem
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	when the family had a viewing of the body. As
8		I understand the position, there was something said at
9		that viewing by a relative of Mr Bayoh?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	And they made comments, it is said, that there would be
12		some sort of violence or repercussions as a result of
13		this?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	I wonder if I can ask you about your statement,
16		paragraph 102. I think we heard something of this when
17		Mr Lewis, the FLO, gave evidence.
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	That he had prepared a report which I think came to your
20		attention; is that right?
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	Here we are, you are asked about:
23		"Following the family viewing of the body
24		[Mr] Lewis submitted an incident message stating that
25		during the viewing a brother-in-law of [Mr] Bayoh had

1 made comments ... that there would be violence as a result of [Mr] Bayoh's death." 2 3 You say: 4 "I do recall that Alistair Lewis submitted such 5 a message. The message was passed to the incident room. My recollection is that no action was taken. I believed 6 7 that this was a comment made at a time of considerable 8 duress by a family member." 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. Did you treat this as a serious matter that required 11 investigation or further action to be taken? 12 Α. No, I didn't treat it -- I treated it as I have said 13 there, you know. No, I didn't -- so obviously, as we 14 have talked about on Friday, the kind of -- how 15 traumatic attending a mortuary is to view one of your loved ones. No, I didn't consider this a concern. 16 17 I can't -- I can't recall if I spoke to Police Scotland 18 about it in respect of community impact, you know, 19 because that is a side they deal with, it's not PIRC's 20 role. But I didn't consider this of any great concern, 21 I have to be honest with you. 22 Is it customary for FLOs to issue these things called Q. 23 incident messages of anything has been said at a post mortem in these circumstances? 24 No. It was -- no. No. It may have been something they 25 Α.

1 would -- you know, you know, it is connected to the 2 family so I would expect it would be recorded into the 3 FLO log, it may be brought to my attention that it's in 4 the FLO log or there was an incident message put in. 5 But I ... I ... I don't recall us and myself deeming it necessary to take any action in respect to that. As 6 7 I said, I spoke to Alistair about it, and, yes. And my 8 recollection is that I felt it was, you know, if there 9 had been something else that had came to light then 10 obviously that would have changed my thinking, but I don't recall~... 11 12 Q. I am interested in the distinction between maybe 13 something being noted in the FLO log and maybe brought 14 to your attention at some point and what is called here 15 an incident message. Is there a difference in status 16 relating to --No, no, it's just -- it's all information that is 17 Α. 18 contained within the MIR, the major incident room, it is all information that is contained in there. Alistair 19 20 obviously decided to put it into an incident message. 21 We would need to look at the FLO log for that day and see if it was mentioned in that. I can't recall. 22 Do you understand why he elected to put it in 23 Q. 24 an incident message and draw it to your attention that 25 way?

1	A.	Maybe he thought it would get to my attention quicker.
2	Q.	When you spoke to Mr Lewis about this, was there any
3		expectation that you would do something in relation to
4		this?
5	Α.	Sorry, I can't recall. That is something Alistair would
6		need to, if he had an expectation
7	Q.	We may hear there is not an entry in the FLO log
8		describing this.
9	Α.	All right, okay.
10	Q.	Does that surprise you or does it not
11	Α.	Well, it is recorded and it is recorded in the
12		incident so it's not like it's not recorded and we
13		are not aware of it.
14	Q.	On Friday we touched on the issue of the knife.
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	And I would like to just finalise one entry in the
17		daybook and ask you about that
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	before we leave it. It's if we can have the
20		daybook it's PIRC~
21	Α.	4520?
22	Q.	Let's try that. That is the one. PIRC 4520. Thank you
23		so much. I think it is page 28. There is a reference
24		to a knife at the very bottom of that page. If we look
25		at page just look at the very, very bottom of

1 page 28. Keep going. One of the sheets is a covering sheet so let's try page 27. There it is. Do you see at 2 3 the very bottom it says: "Knife??" 4 5 Just to put this into context, if we go to the previous page, which would be page 26, you will see at 6 7 the top of that page this is dealing with Thursday, 8 7 May. So you have reported on duty on 7 May. 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. Then if we look at page 27, which is the next page, this is the part of your daybook where you are dealing with 11 12 items on that day. I think you were asked on Friday 13 when you became aware that the information in the 14 briefing note about the knife was incorrect. And I just 15 want to look at the bottom of that page there. Where there is a reference to "Knife??", do you remember 16 17 anything about the reason you made that note on that day, that is 7 May? 18 19 Sorry, I am just reading the sort of previous entries to Α. 20 get a wee flavour of why I had that. 21 Q. Yes, please do. (Pause). So these are notes I have made before the morning 22 Α. 23 briefing because I have got the morning briefing at the 24 next page, 8.35 meeting. 25 (Pause).

1 No, I ... I am unsure. I'm unsure. It may well have been in respect of did we have a knife, had we 2 3 taken possession of a knife. It may well have been we had the knife but then we need to consider what forensic 4 5 approach we take to a knife because you need to be careful what process you use first, if we're looking for 6 7 fingerprints, if we're looking for DNA, what process 8 takes precedent because if you do one before the other 9 you destroy~... and I can't remember which one it is at 10 this moment in time. But I am surmising there. I am 11 surmising. 12 Q. All right. I just wanted to ask you in case that 13 refreshed your memory. Can we have move on then to 14 something in paragraph 136 of your Inquiry statement. 15 So this would be 421. There is a reference to decision 34 in the policy log. It is quoted there, 16 17 decision 34: 18 "It is clear that [Crown Office] are providing 19 information to Mr Anwar the family solicitor, regarding 20 the investigation, post mortem and other findings." 21 This entry in the log is dated 17 May. 22 Α. Yes. 23 There was this note that information was being provided Q. 24 to Mr Anwar: 25 "PIRC are unsighted on some of these matters and

1 this can undermine and compromise our dealings with the deceased family." 2 3 That is an entry in the policy log made by 4 Mr McSporran. 5 Α. Yes. 6 Q. You say: 7 "Yes I did, this course of action presented 8 a challenge in PIRC's dealing with the family and their 9 lawyer as it could arise that information provided by 10 the FLOs was at variance to that already provided by [Crown Office]." 11 12 Can you tell us a little bit more about this issue 13 and the difficulties that PIRC experienced because of 14 it? 15 I mean, as I say in my response to that Rule 8 question Α. there is the normal -- the normal process in dealing --16 17 in a death investigation is the fact that the family liaison officers are the single point of contact with 18 the family. And all information in respect of the 19 20 incident you are investigating whilst you are conducting 21 that investigation is routed through to the family liaison officers. So you have this single point of 22 contact, you are trying to minimise any ambiguity, any 23 24 conflict of information, any inaccurate information 25 being passed. And the reason I say that is COPFS are

aware of what we tell them, okay, but that is getting told to them in a kind of briefing paper or if there is a meeting. The live and current information is being held in the investigation in -- by myself and John in the incident room.

So if you have COPFS providing information to the 6 7 family solicitor who is the -- who is the point of 8 contact for the family, and he is relaying that to the 9 family, then when the FLOs have a meeting with the 10 family -- not every meeting was Mr Anwar out with the FLOs -- and they provide some information that is at 11 12 variance to what Crown, then that is compounding in my 13 mind what happened in the first day of this 14 investigation, there is conflicting information being 15 pass to the family and that really prevented or presented untold issues in the relationship and the 16 17 building a relationship with the family and building 18 trust.

So the whole point of that, and I think it was Mr Mitchell then took that up with Crown is I am not saying Crown don't tell information to the family, the family were -- Mr Anwar was in fairly -- my understanding fairly regular dialogue with senior officials within Crown, but if they are, tell us, and tell us what you are telling them so at least the FLOs

1 when they go to see -- because the FLOs could be going in there and they're saying, "Well, we've been told by 2 3 the Lord Advocate that this has happened", and we are 4 like, "Well we don't know that". You know. They've 5 maybe said something that is more current than what Crown have told them and more accurate than what Crown 6 7 has told them. You know. So I -- I agree with what 8 John said there. Q. So it could be that the Crown information that is being 9 10 shared is perhaps based on an old briefing paper or out-of-date? 11 12 Α. Yes, because as we gather more evidence, you know, you 13 start to get a clearer picture of what has happened. Or it could be that their information is bang up-to-date 14 Q. 15 but PIRC aren't aware of it? Yes, it could be well be. It could be information that 16 Α. 17 has come direct from the pathologist to them, the pathologist is employed by the Crown not PIRC, you know. 18 19 Can we look at paragraph 138 of your statement. I think Q. 20 here your response is: 21 "In my experience both with the police and that of PIRC this was unusual and I cannot recall another time 22 this has happened whilst a live investigation was 23 ongoing and prior to the circumstances being reported to 24 25 [Crown Office]."

1		So the PIRC investigation is ongoing, it is live.
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	There has not been a report to Crown Office at that
4		stage but in that period of time the Crown are having
5		are direct conversations with the lawyer who is the
6		single point of contact for the family?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	Up until that point had you experienced this happening
9		with any other investigation?
10	A.	No.
11	Q.	Since then have you experienced it with
12		an investigation?
13	A.	No.
14	Q.	Do you looking back now, do you think some of the
15		difficulties with communication with the family in
16		relation to the FLOs contributed to this situation
17		arising?
18	A.	I don't think I don't think you know, difficulties
19		with the FLO, I think the challenge arose because of the
20		fact of what happened on day one and what happened on
21		3 May. You had this, right from the very start,
22		conflicting information passed to the family,
23		potentially as death messages. You then had a senior
24		officer visiting the family passing on information.
25		I remember from the family saying that you know

1 Mr McEwan says, "I shouldn't be telling you this", you know and then -- I don't know how Police Scotland had 2 3 a challenge identifying and introducing FLOs on 3 May 4 bearing the size of the organisation they are. It has 5 never been an issue before and it has never been an issue since. So why were all these issues thrown up 6 7 on the first day of this investigation? And that 8 compounded by the time -- when Alistair and John got to sit down with the family, my feeling is they were on the 9 10 back foot in trying to build a relationship with the family because of what had preceded beforehand, you 11 12 know.

13 So, yes, and for whatever reason the family 14 solicitor engaged directly with Crown and directly with 15 very senior people within Crown in respect of that. 16 I am not aware of that ever happening -- it may have 17 happened in other investigations but I'm not aware of it 18 and it is not something we got feedback from, so you 19 know I am not aware of it.

Q. So from your perspective on 4 May as lead investigator
and then to be involved --

22 A. Yes.

Q. -- after that with John McSporran, many of these issues
arose because of the difficulties on 3 May?

25 A. Absolutely.

1 Q. And they continued to have an impact? 2 Compounded by a number of things. You know, the Α. 3 numerous death messages passed to the family, the 4 conflicting information, the failure to deploy FLOs, the 5 failure for the PIM process, or the PIP process to work when you -- you know, and then we ended up we didn't 6 7 have any statements. There were all these matters all 8 compounding in as well as you had a death of a black man in the street whilst being arrested by the police. 9 10 Q. You have talked about the impact of that in your investigation. Did it have an impact on the 11 12 relationship between PIRC and the family? 13 I think so. Yes, I think so. Α. Did it have an impact on PIRC's relationship with the 14 Q. 15 Crown? No, I don't think -- I don't think that. I am not aware 16 Α. 17 of ... Certainly then Mr Mitchell spoke to Crown, so 18 how that was viewed and how that was received, that is for Mr Mitchell to talk about, but --19 He has given a statement to the Inquiry about this 20 Q. 21 matter so we will no doubt hear from him at some point. 22 Yes, I -- my job and John's job when we take on is to Α. conduct an effective investigation and gather 23 24 the evidence, examine that evidence, and report to Crown 25 on that. Then, you know, if Crown wish further

1 investigations undertaken, which is not unusual, then we would do that further investigation and Crown make 2 3 a decision in respect of what takes place. 4 So we were working through these challenges to get 5 that information, it just felt as if there was always a hurdle every day there was a hurdle, you know, and 6 7 going in: what have we got? Bang, bang, we've got this, 8 we've got this. Right, you know ~... So I think as 9 I said in my Rule 8 everything was slow, taking longer than it should have done, everything felt like a bit of 10 a -- I won't say a fight, but everything was 11 12 a challenge. 13 Q. We will come back to that. Thank you. Can I ask you 14 about a couple of issues regarding the behaviour of 15 investigators. 16 Α. Yes. If we could look at paragraph 116. You were asked about 17 Q. 18 PIRC taking a statement from Mr James Hume. Your response to that is -- in relation to the question you 19 20 were asked. PIRC investigators took a statement from 21 James Hume regarding drugs and alcohol and such like. 22 And Mr Hume said that he felt he was being asked leading questions and it felt accusatory rather than 23 24 fact-finding and he was left upset and it built mistrust 25 from him towards PIRC and the police.

1 Your response is you were not aware of any concerns raised by witnesses in relation to PIRC's report? 2 3 Α. No. 4 Q. Approach: "Given the cause of death, information regarding the 5 deceased use of alcohol, drugs and steroids was 6 7 absolutely central to the matter under investigation. 8 How this information was elicited I cannot answer but 9 should be referred to the investigators who obtained 10 Mr Hume's statements." 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. When you were taking on the role of lead investigator or 13 deputy to Mr McSporran, is this the type of information 14 you would like to be brought to your attention if 15 witnesses have concerns about the behaviour of PIRC investigators? 16 Absolutely. 17 Α. 18 Q. What could you do in your role either as lead 19 investigator or deputy to resolve issues like this? 20 Well, you know, if -- you can't do anything unless you Α. are made aware of something, so if Mr Hume had passed 21 that information to us or the information had came via 22 the family solicitor, and Mr Hume was a family --23 a friend of Mr Bayoh, then, yes, in the first instance 24 25 I would have spoken to the two investigators, in respect

1 of what had happened, and if necessary Mr Hume could 2 have made a complaint. We have a complaint process 3 which is clearly documented on our website and was at 4 that time, and -- and a complaint would have been taken, 5 it would have been passed to somebody independent within PIRC, I would suspect not within the investigation 6 7 department, and passed to that person to investigate 8 that complaint. If you were line manager and a complaint was made about 9 Q. 10 one of your investigators that you line manage, is that something that would be brought to your attention? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 Were you aware of any complaints -- this may not be for Q. 14 you, it may be for someone else, but you were aware of 15 any complaints about an investigator Ross Crawford in relation to taking a statement from a Karen Swan? 16 That is -- Ross Stewart. 17 Α. 18 Ross Stewart, sorry. Were you aware of any complaints Q. in relation to Ross Stewart? 19 20 I was aware that we withdrew Ross Stewart from taking Α. 21 a statement from Ms Swan or Mrs Swan. Circumstances --22 yes, I was aware of that. There are circumstances all 23 round about getting the statement of Ms Swan, you know, and -- and I spoke to Ross in respect of what happened 24 25 because Mr Anwar made a complaint about Mr Stewart, and

1 taking the statement. I had actioned Mr Stewart to take that statement and I had actioned alongside a person who 2 was a non-police person for better expression. 3 4 Mrs Swan provided information regarding a family 5 conflict with one of the police officers. There was 6 a reluctance in getting the statement, although the 7 information had been relayed during a BBC programme, 8 that Ms Swan had -- it had been relayed and the reason I put Mr Stewart in to that, to take that is you know 9 10 that the inference is my recollection is that Ms Swan 11 was fearful about passing this information over to us. 12 Mr Stewart's previous experience had been within the 13 witness liaison team, the national witness liaison team, 14 witness protection so he understood how to allay fears 15 of people who felt reluctant or whatever. 16 But I am aware that -- yes. And I spoke to 17 Mr Stewart about the circumstances of why Mr Anwar asked for him to be removed from that interview and we sent 18 19 down another investigator who doesn't have a policing background take a statement. 20 21 Q. So what were the complaints in relation to Mr Stewart's 22 behaviour that gave rise to this complaint from 23 Mr Anwar? A. It is -- it was John McSporran that spoke to Mr Anwar, 24 25 okay? But my understanding from Ross is during the

1 course of taking the statement, it was just in the early stages of the statement, Ms Swan made reference to 2 3 an incident that had occurred with her brother. Her 4 brother is a couple of years -- she is younger of her 5 brother and it was an incident that occurred, and my recollection is that an incident occurred when her 6 brother was a very young age and Ross had --7 I am asking Mr Stewart's behaviour. 8 Q. Yes, yes, but Mr Stewart had questioned how the witness 9 Α. 10 could recall that at such a young stage. 11 Q. Sorry for interrupting. 12 And Mr Anwar objected to that, stating it is not for Α. 13 Mr Stewart to be questioning what the witness says and that -- my understanding is Mr Anwar contacted John and 14 15 we withdrew Ross and put down another investigator. So it was resolved by sending two other investigators in 16 Q. to take --17 18 No, no. We kept the first investigator there who was in Α. 19 on --You sent if a separate one instead of Mr Stewart? 20 Q. 21 Α. We sent in a separate investigate investigator from 22 a non-policing background. We may hear further evidence about this, that Mrs Swan 23 Q. had been quite upset about Mr Stewart's attitude during 24 25 the statement. Does that accord with your recollection?

1 Α. My recollection is that Mr Anwar objected to -- I don't 2 recall, you know, what happened with Ms Swan. 3 Thank you. Can I ask you about a separate matter now, Q. 4 please. Can we look at an article in The Herald 5 newspaper from 15 May 2015. This is AA C00379, page 7 only. You will see this is a black and white copy of --6 7 you will see at the side it says The Herald, 8 15 May 2015. It's headed: "Custody death family: Tell us the truth and let us 9 10 grieve." With some pictures and such like. When did you 11 12 become aware of this article in the Herald newspaper? I don't recall. I don't recall. I was obviously aware 13 Α. 14 there was -- there was a lot of media reporting 15 throughout the whole investigation, a lot of media reporting. So ... no. 16 Were you having important media reports brought to your 17 Q. attention by anyone PIRC? 18 19 They were being collated by our -- one of our media Α. 20 office, one of our media staff in our media room, yes. 21 Q. Do you remember seeing this article? No, I can't -- I can't recall. 22 Α. 23 So on 15 May you didn't yet have statements from the Q. 24 officers. No. 25 Α.

1 Q. They were the 4 June. 2 No. Α. 3 And there are a number of apparent quotes within the Q. 4 body of this, so can I ask you to look on the left-hand 5 column. 6 A. Yes. 7 In this article, by Brian Donnelly, senior news Q. 8 reporter. Peter Watson -- at the bottom of page: 9 "Peter Watson, a lawyer for eight police officers involved in the case, said that the officer feared for 10 her life and had been attempting to run away." 11 12 That is a reference just under: 13 "A policewoman who is described as 'petite' was 14 injured in the early morning incident." 15 Then the next column, just slightly down. Again, there is a reference to Peter Watson of PBW Law. And 16 17 the quotation there is: "While it is deeply regrettable that Mr Bayoh lost 18 19 his life, I would ask the media and public to remember 20 that a petite female police officer was chased and then 21 subjected to a violent and unprovoked attack by a very large man who punched, kicked and stamped on her. 22 "The officer believed she was about to be murdered 23 24 and I can say that but for the intervention of the other 25 officers that was the likely outcome.

1 "We all seek the truth and part of that truth will lie in part in the post mortem and toxicology reports 2 3 which will follow in due course. Calls for the 4 suspension of the officers serve no purpose and do 5 nothing but add unhelpful rhetoric in a difficult situation for all." 6 7 Do you see that? 8 Α. Yes. Can I ask you about the comment that is made there by 9 Q. 10 Peter Watson of PBW Law where it is said in quotation 11 marks: 12 "... a very large man who punched, kicked and 13 stamped on her." 14 That is a reference to the petite female officer. 15 Α. Mm-hm. Can I ask you now to look at your Inquiry statement at 16 Q. 17 paragraph 127 because I think you have been asked about this article. So that is 127. I think you were asked 18 about the article, it was quoted to you and can we move 19 20 down to your response: 21 "I can recall that this statement was released by the SPF but have no recollection of any discussion 22 within PIRC about it. I do recall being surprised they 23 24 had made this statement." 25 Just to be clear, the statement that you are being

1		asked about here is the press release by SPF. I wonder
2		if we can just move up slightly. Could we look at
3		SPF 0010A. So this is the press release not the article
4		that I have just shown you.
5	A.	Okay, so I wasn't asked about the article?
6	Q.	You weren't asked about the article, you were asked
7		about the
8	A.	Okay, because I have no recollection of that being in
9		the paperwork.
10	Q.	So you have no recollection of the article at all?
11	A.	No, not the article.
12	Q.	This is the media release issued by Scottish
13		Police Federation. That is dated 14 May, so that is
14		the day prior to the article appearing in The Herald on
15		15 May. Do you see that?
16	A.	Mm-hmm.
17	Q.	And if we move down, there is a reference:
18		"Speaking in response to the comments made at the
19		press conference by representatives of the family for
20		Sheku Bayoh this morning, Brian Docherty, Chairman of
21		the Scottish Police Federation said;
22		"The Scottish Police Federation recognises that
23		the family of Sheku Bayoh is mourning his death and that
24		this is a painful process.
25		"The SPF does not wish to add to that pain by making

unhelpful comments to the press. We are saddened that
 his legal representatives appear not to take the same
 approach.

We are also saddened that his legal representatives
are inferring police officers should not have the same
legal protections as any other member of the public.

7 "A petite female police officer responding to a call
8 of a man brandishing a knife was subject to a violent
9 and unprovoked attack by a large male. The officer
10 believed she was going to die as a result of this
11 assault.

I2 "I very much regret that Mr Bayoh sadly lost his own life following this incident but innuendo and speculation whilst the independent investigation is ongoing adds nothing other than to the pain and grief of the family.

We make no apology for standing up for the rights of police officers and we continue to extend to the family and friends of Mr Bayoh our sincere condolences."

20 So I think in your Inquiry statement you were asked 21 about this press release but not asked specifically 22 about the article that then appeared?

23 A. Yes.

Q. So the press release is the 14th, the article is the15th, the following day, and we can see that there are

1	differences between this press release from SPF and the
2	article that was published and primarily I am interested
3	in the remarks from Peter Watson who is representing
4	eight of the officers, it is said.
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. As I understand it, he also represents SPF. His
7	comments it was Mr Watson's comments that mentioned
8	the kicking, the "punched, kicked and stamped on the
9	female officer". Do you see that?
10	A. That is it is not there anymore but yes, I remember
11	you said that. It was on the article.
12	MS GRAHAME: We can put the article back on screen.
13	Actually, I am conscious of the time and it may be we
14	should simply pause there.
15	LORD BRACADALE: We will take a 20-minute break at this
16	stage.
17	(11.31 am)
18	(A short break)
19	(11.55 am)
20	LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
21	MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Let's just recap on what we were
22	looking at before the break. So I asked you to look at
23	the media release and that was dated 14 May 2015.
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. I will give you the reference to that in a second. If

1 we could look first of all actually at paragraph 127 of 2 your Inquiry statement. Paragraph 127. This is where 3 you were asked by the Inquiry team about a media release 4 that had been issued by SPF the Federation. And your 5 response was you can recall this statement was released bit SPF but you had no recollection of any discussion 6 7 within PIRC about it: "I do recall being surprised that they had made this 8 statement." 9 10 So when were you made aware that SPF were -- had issued a media release? 11 12 A. I can't recall. I would imagine that would have been --13 I don't know what time the media release was, you know, 14 was released. I'd imagine it would have been the next day, the 15th. 15 It was dated the 14th. Do you think it was likely to be 16 Q. the 15th you became aware --17 18 Α. Yes. You know, whenever it came into the organisation, 19 I would be surprised -- yes. Q. We can see there the doc ID is SPF 00010A. And if we 20 21 can move down the page, we looked at this before the break. The media release from SPF said: 22 "A petite female police officer responding to a call 23 of a man brandishing a knife was subject to a violent 24 and unprovoked attack by a large male. The officer 25

1		believed she was going to die as a result of this
2		assault."
3		So that was the extent of the SPF's media release at
4		that time?
5	Α.	Yes.
6	Q.	So you didn't have any statements from the officers at
7		this stage
8	Α.	No.
9	Q.	but that would appear to at least be some information
10		for you in connection with the petite female officer?
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	Did you know who that petite female police officer was
13		when you read this?
14	Α.	I know they are talking about Nicole Short. Did I know
15		that at the time? Yes, I would have known that at the
16		time because Nicole Short we were aware that
17		Nicole Short had been taken to hospital. Yes.
18	Q.	We've heard evidence that Nicole Short had been taken to
19		hospital after the incident and then brought back to the
20		canteen at Kirkcaldy Police Office
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	on 3 May 2015. She had remained there for a period
23		of time. Her equipment and clothing had been taken
24		along with the other officers.
25	Α.	Yes.

1	Q.	So were you aware that that had been done and that
2		Nicole Short was the female police officer?
3	A.	Yes well, there was more than one female police
4		officer at the scene but I was aware that Nicole Short
5		was the officer who had been taken to hospital.
6	Q.	So you were aware she had been injured, taken to
7		hospital and we have heard evidence from Nicole Short
8		and we have can I say she appeared petite, of short
9		stature.
10	A.	I never made ever met her, so I don't I never met
11		her.
12	Q.	Thank you. So you are made aware of this. You think it
13		would have been on the day or the next day that you were
14		made aware of it?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	This is information that you didn't previously have in
17		relation to at least one of the police officers who you
18		now know to be Nicole Short?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	Then let's look at the article that appeared in
21		The Herald on the 15 May. This is at page 7, sorry.
22		There it is. We can see I referred to you before
23		the break on the left-hand column the comment from
24		Peter Watson, lawyer for eight police officers involved
25		in the case:

1		" the officer feared for her life and had been
2		attempting to run away."
3		Again, would that be new information that was
4		available to you?
5	Α.	It would have been, yes.
6	Q.	Right.
7	Α.	I don't recall that article, I don't recall reading that
8		article.
9	Q.	Do you recall anyone drawing this article to your
10		attention?
11	Α.	No. I remember when the Police Federation issued this
12		statement and
13	Q.	The media release?
14	A.	The media release, yes. And I remember actually
15		I actually think it was on TV, I think actually the
16		SPF if my recollection is right, it was covered on
17		television. I remember being surprised by it, that they
18		had that they had come out with that actually, yes.
19	Q.	I also referred you to the second the column to the
20		right of that first column, where Peter Watson is quoted
21		as saying that she had been:
22		" subjected to a violent and unprovoked attack by
23		a very large man who punched, kicked and stamped on
24		her."
25	A.	Yes.

1	0	
1	Q.	I think you said before the break you don't remember
2		and I think you have said now you don't remember reading
3		this article?
4	Α.	No, I don't, no.
5	Q.	Do you remember if this article was drawn to your
6		attention by anyone within PIRC?
7	Α.	Not that I recall, it may have been but not that
8		I recall, no.
9	Q.	Do you remember any discussions in PIRC going on around
10		about 15 May that Peter Watson had said there was
11		a violent and unprovoked attack by a very large man who
12		punched, kicked and stamped on her?
13	A.	I can't specifically no. No, I can't specifically.
14		I remember myself being surprised about it, by the
15		Police Federation coming out this statement in respect
16		to that. There was so much media attention ongoing, you
17		know, in respect of this incident. My primary focus was
18		the focus on investigation, taking the investigation
19		forward and evidence-gathering in respect of that. So
20		that I can't I can't recall that. I remember
21		being surprised by the Police Federation coming out with
22		that and why they did that, you know that is obviously
23		for the Federation to explain, you know.
24		But no, I don't remember it being that
25		information, particularly in respect of what

1 Peter Watson is saying in the paper there because it is -- it is different from what is on the official media 2 3 release, if I can put it that way. No, I don't remember 4 that. 5 Was anybody in PIRC talking about the fact that this Q. 6 article had appeared in the papers and the lawyer 7 representing some of the officers appeared to be making 8 a reference to punch, kick and stamping on who you know to be Nicole Short? 9 10 Α. I don't remember that. The aspect of Mr Watson and the Federation, that was -- that was -- I think I said on 11 12 Friday that was taken away in the main from John and I. 13 It was dealt with by Mr Mitchell and the Commissioner, 14 and I think you will be aware of all the correspondence 15 round about that. But I don't recall that. I do remember being surprised because again, one of 16 17 the things I am not aware of the Federation coming out 18 and making a statement in the middle of 19 an investigation, you know, so ... I will come on to the surprise in a moment, but do you 20 Q. 21 remember any conversation with Mr Mitchell in relation 22 to this suggestion that there had been a punch, a kick 23 and a stamp? No. Not at this time, no. 24 Α.

25 Q. At this time you don't have any statements from the

1		officers, you are looking for information about what
2		happened at Hayfield Road. Would it have been helpful
3		if that information had been drawn to your attention?
4	A.	Yes, because that is the information we didn't possess,
5		you know. Yes.
6	Q.	Would that have had any impact on your investigation as
7		such, the lines that you were pursuing, if it was the
8		case that Nicole Short had been punched, kicked and
9		stamped?
10	A.	It wouldn't have changed the investigation as it was
11		ongoing at that time, you know on reflection sitting
12		here now it wouldn't have changed but it would have been
13		something you would be looking to say can we actually
14		evidence that, did that actually happen, or is that just
15		Mr Watson coming out and saying this. The benefit
16		Mr Watson had is he had obviously been in dialogue with
17		the officers. And we know
18	Q.	He was representing
19	A.	that in hindsight, we know that in hindsight, that
20		you know~
21	Q.	It says in that article that he is the lawyer for eight
22		police officers involved. Do you remember in the
23		left-hand column
24	Α.	Sorry.
25	Q.	I drew that to your attention?

1 Α. Right, yes. 2 Q. It said: 3 "... the officer feared for her life and had been 4 attempting to run away." Do you remember that? So you were aware he was 5 representing a number of the officers? 6 7 Α. Yes. If you had had that drawn to your attention, who would 8 Q. 9 have been responsible in PIRC for bringing information from the media to your attention? 10 I would have expected that to come from our media 11 Α. 12 department. I hadn't allocated an investigator to 13 research all media, such like it was the media that --14 our media department was -- you know, it is something 15 that gets done anyway. They look at the press releases, you know, for what articles there may be concerning PIRC 16 17 or whatever on a regular basis, so I would have expected that to come from them. 18 19 In terms of your investigation and your expectations of Q. 20 that media department, would you have expected them to 21 draw this type of information to your attention when they read it? 22 Yes, I would. 23 Α. 24 Q. Or shortly thereafter? Yes, yes. 25 Α.

1	Q.	If you had been if you had had this drawn to your
2		attention, would it have caused you to consider whether
3		there were any forensic implications of this
4		information?
5	A.	Now, I would need to see the minutes but we had
6		I think about a week after the incident we had
7		a forensic strategy meeting with representatives from
8		the SPA.
9	Q.	Scottish Police Authority?
10	A.	Yes, sorry, and yes, Scottish Police Authority. We
11		had a forensic meeting and the purpose of that
12		meeting and Ms Shearer was at it as well and the
13		Crown was at it as well was to what evidence have
14		we got, what articles have we seized and what needs
15		progressed and in what manner.
16	Q.	Do you have an entry in your daybook or in your notebook
17		that might relate to that?
18	A.	I don't know because it was minuted, there was an agenda
19		and there was minutes taken. So I don't that would
20		be the best But there was examination undertaken in
21		respect of the body armour vest worn by Nicole Short, in
22		respect of footwear, and footwear comparison against.
23		When that exactly was undertaken, there would be
24		an action for it, and as I said we had the forensic
25		strategy meeting, the exact date I can't remember

1		sitting here at this moment. Then thereafter we
2		progressed the the articles and the manner and line
3		of what we had discussed and agreed at the
4	Q.	I would like to come on to that the forensic
5		implications if I may, but can I go back to in your
6		statement you had as in evidence you have said you were
7		surprised in relation to the media statement that was
8		the media released issued by SPF?
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	Can you explain to the Chair why that was of surprise to
11		you?
12	A.	I think it's maybe a wee bit of naivety. You know, in
13		PIRC in respect of any media releases that we are going
14		to make on a Crown-directed investigation we will not
15		make that media release until we have okayed it with
16		Crown. And that is the same as Police Scotland,
17		Police Scotland will not make any media release until
18		Crown say, "Yes, I agree with that media release", so
19		any proposed media release would go to Crown and Crown
20		would examine that and a lot of times alter it, you know
21		in respect of
22	Q.	Why is that done?
23	A.	That is just to ensure that there's my impression of
24		why it's done is just to ensure that there's a (a)
25		there's an accurate message getting put out there, and

1 also to preserve the integrity of the investigation in 2 respect of information being passed out. 3 So the police are aware of that, we're aware of it, 4 Crown is aware of it, and there you have a -- the 5 Federation, the police union, you know, in the main with police officers in it and they have made this statement. 6 7 Now, I understand Mr Watson, but the Police Federation 8 have made this statement, you know, so as I said it may be a wee bit of naivety on my part thinking, you know, 9 10 why have they just come out with that? If the Police Federation had followed the same practice 11 Q. 12 as yourself, PIRC, the police and had any media 13 statements approved by the Crown or revised, would you 14 have expected the Federation to also follow the same 15 practice? 16 I think that is why I was surprised that never having Α. encountered it before, then you know -- I don't know how 17 18 it is governed by them in respect of a Crown 19 investigation, and release of information. Because that 20 is information being released, and as you say prior to 21 us even having sat down and taken statements off the officers or the principal officers. 22

Q. We may hear evidence from Mr Mitchell later in this
hearing in relation to concerns he had about things in
the press from the Federation. Did you share concerns

1 about the Federation, or officers putting things out in 2 the public domain through press releases or articles? 3 Yes. Yes, it felt as if at times the investigation was Α. 4 being conducted through the media. I have to be honest 5 with you, and I do remember that at one point the Lord Advocate and I think the Justice Minister came out 6 7 and basically issued a statement asking for the running 8 commentary you know to cease while the investigation is 9 ongoing. So what powers there was to prevent this, 10 I don't think there's any, you know. From the perspective of PIRC and carrying out their 11 Q. 12 investigation, would it have been helpful for none of 13 the media issues to be raised at that stage? Yes. Yes. It would have been. And it would have been 14 Α. 15 helpful in respect of our relationship with the family for that. Because they are seeing this information 16 17 coming out, and as the investigatory body, you know, an expectation: well, how's that information getting 18 19 there, why is that getting allowed to be released? 20 So~... 21 Q. Can I ask you, if you had had this information brought 22 to your attention, so the punched, kicked and stamped 23 information --24 Α. Yes.

25 Q. -- is that something that you could have discussed with

the forensic scientists? I will tell you why I am 1 asking. We have heard evidence that the forensic lab 2 obtained footwear --3 4 Α. Yes. 5 Q. -- from Mr Bayoh and a vest from Nicole Short on 14 May, so that is the date that the press release -- the media 6 7 release was issued. And the day before the Herald 8 article came out. The final report was sent to you on 9 24 August and I say it was sent to you, Mr Little, by 10 the lab. So that was a period of around three months -over three months when they had those items. 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 You've said earlier today the order of testing can be of Q. 14 significance? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Now, if you had known on 15 May that there was this Q. 17 suggestion that a man had punched, kicked and stamped on Nicole Short, is that something that you could have 18 shared with the forensic lab and discussed with them 19 20 about what tests should be done, what order of tests 21 should be done? It would have formed part of the discussion. If we 22 Α. had -- I think we had the information about the punch, 23 I think we had spoken to a witness there by that time 24 25 who had given us information regarding the punch. But

1 the stamp -- but we were obviously -- we obviously --2 how do we get to sending the vest before that and how 3 did we have that information? I can't remember. Maybe 4 within the minutes of the forensic strategy meeting it 5 would identify that, I can't remember. But we had obviously lodged the vest and the footwear prior to this 6 7 newspaper article, so was it because there was a mark on 8 the vest or -- I can't recall what -- you know, the 9 actual timescale and the order how that happened. 10 Q. This article is 15 May? Yes, I understand that. I am talking about how we 11 Α. 12 got -- you know, presenting the footwear, you know and 13 asking for comparison of footwear against the vest. You 14 know, the body armour. 15 Q. You sent the vest to the lab, did you consider whether or not fingerprint testing had to be done at all? 16 17 On the vest? Α. Mm-hm? 18 Q. 19 I don't recall that, no. Α. 20 We have heard evidence that when they carry out Q. 21 fingerprint testing they use a black powder --22 Α. Yes. -- which can be dusted over but that can have an impact 23 Q. 24 on any woven material. Yes. 25 Α.

1	Q.	And that can subsequently have a detrimental impact on
2		the ability of forensic scientists to carry out
3		subsequent testing.
4	Α.	But I go back to what I said earlier, the whole point of
5		the forensic strategy meeting is to discuss with the
6		experts from the different departments of the SPA in
7		respect of what articles we've got, what examination we
8		would like them to undertake, and actually the order,
9		the mechanics of how you undertake that because, you
10		know the example I gave was fingerprints and DNA, and
11		I am aware that if you do one before the other then
12		you're almost mitigating the ability to do the latter,
13		so
14	Q.	So you were aware of that when you attended the forensic
15		strategy meeting?
16	Α.	Oh, yes, I am aware of that, yes.
17	Q.	Did you say that was around a week later?
18	Α.	Yes, I can't remember the date of forensic strategy
19		meeting.
20	Q.	Did you find anything in your notebook or in your
21		daybook
22	Α.	Sorry, I never looked. My apologies, I never looked.
23	Q.	Would you have a look?
24	Α.	I tell you what might be easier, is it not in my $\dots$ in
25		my first my initial statement, right at the very $\dots$

1	Q.	If you think it was roughly about a week later, that
2		would be about the 11th and there are entries on page 6
3		of your notebook, which is PIRC 04200. Entries of the
4		10 May and 12 May. That is page 6. That is roughly
5		around a week later. Can you find anything? There is
6		a reference I think on the 12th to a forensic strategy
7		meeting?
8	Α.	Yes, 12 May:
9		"Forensic strategy meeting at Howden Hall forensic
10		lab. Strategy agreed."
11	Q.	What does that say after that?
12	A.	"Advise verbally that Sheku had amphetamine and ecstasy
13		within his system. Full details to follow."
14	Q.	There is no mention there of any fingerprint or the type
15		of order of the analysis.
16	A.	Yes, but that is what I said, it was minuted, the
17		meeting. We had a minute taker there at the meeting.
18		There was an agenda on the meeting because there was
19		a number of areas to cover, so there was an agenda
20		drafted up and there was somebody assigned to minute
21		taking. So we had representatives there from Crown,
22		pathology, SPA, Police Scotland.
23	Q.	I will see if we can the Inquiry team can look for
24		that.
25	A.	There are there were minutes of that meeting.

1 Q. Let me see, I don't know if this is actually on the playlist for today but it's PIRC 04161. It's not on the 2 3 playlist. What we'll do is we will maybe come back to 4 this in the afternoon once we can have that added and 5 shown on the screen, and I will come back to those 6 questions once you've got the minutes in front of you. 7 Α. Thank you. 8 Can I turn to another press statement. 2 June, if we Q. 9 look at PIRC 04521. Let's look at your statement first 10 of all, Inquiry statement, paragraph 159. You are asked about another SPF press statement in that paragraph. So 11 12 that is 159. This is your -- 159. You are asked about 13 another public statement which read, and it is quoted 14 here: 15 "The officers involved have never refused to provide statements." 16 17 This is from SPF, a press statement: "The officers involved have never refused to provide 18 19 statements. It was agreed at the outset with PIRC that 20 they would revert to us when they wanted statements and 21 when they were clear on the basis that statements were 22 to be given. PIRC emailed me this morning at 10.46 am asking for our assistance to organise interviews and we 23 24 answered at 11.29 am confirming we would be pleased to assist. Those are the facts." 25

If we can look at SPF 0019. If we can move down the 1 page, please. You should see a -- here it is. It's in 2 relation to the death of Mr Bayoh: 3 4 "... family lawyer heavily criticised." And it's issued on behalf of the SPF on 2 June 2015. 5 So this is two days prior to you getting statements from 6 7 the officers, which was 4 June. Yes. 8 Α. It says: 9 Q. 10 "The legal adviser to the Scottish Police Federation has responded to criticism levelled at the organisation 11 12 by Aamer Anwar, the lawyer representing the family of 13 Sheku Bayoh." 14 And the quotation there is from 15 Professor Peter Watson of PBW Law. This is issued by the Federation. It says there: 16 17 "The comments made by those representing the family of the deceased continue to promote a completely 18 19 inaccurate and misleading account. The officer injured 20 remains off work, has several hospital visits and is now 21 in rehabilitation. A examination by a leading Consultant confirms her injuries were significant. The 22 injuries have been documented and photographed." 23 24 Then the quotation goes on, and this is the part 25 that was referred to in your statement:

1 "The officers involved have never refused to provide 2 statements. It was agreed at the outset with PIRC that 3 they would revert to us when they wanted statements and 4 when they were clear on the basis that statements were 5 to be given. PIRC emailed me this morning at 10.46 am asking for our assistance to organise interviews and we 6 7 answered at 11.29 am confirming we would be pleased to 8 assist. Those are the facts."

9 If we could go back to your Inquiry statement, 10 please, that is at paragraph 159. That was on the 11 screen a moment ago. If we can look at your response:

12 "I found this unhelpful as it implied that the SPF 13 were waiting all along for PIRC to approach them to have 14 the officers provide statements. It is well documented 15 the efforts we had made with Police Scotland and SPF legal representatives in this regard and this was just 16 17 an unhelpful statement put out to the media making it 18 sound in my opinion that we had been doing nothing in this regard." 19

20 And if we can move up. At paragraph 160 you were 21 asked for a little bit more explanation about that, and 22 you said:

"I did not consider this statement to be accurate
and the officers had refused to provide statements on
previous occasions as detailed in my earlier responses."

1 Then at paragraph 161, again I think you provide a little bit more detail, you say: 2 3 "I did not take any action and I am unsure if anyone else did." 4 5 At 162 you say: "I felt could in the Public's eyes, as it ..." 6 7 This is in response to a question about whether the statement undermined confidence in PIRC: 8 9 "I felt could in the Public's eyes, as it inferred 10 that PIRC had only to ask the SPF for statements from the nine officers and they would have complied, despite 11 12 the fact that a month had passed since the attending 13 officers had refused to provide statements or complete 14 any documentation." 15 I am interested in the situation that arose in 16 relation to this statement that was made by the 17 Federation. If we can maybe perhaps go back to the 18 paragraph 151 which commenced this passage in your 19 Inquiry statement, where it says -- back to 159, sorry. 20 We can see the quotation there. 21 Α. Yes. "The officers have never refused to provide statements." 22 Q. 23 What was your impression when you read that 24 sentence: 25 "The officers have never refused to provide

statements"? 1 2 That is untrue. Mr Watson knew it was untrue and the Α. Federation knew it was untrue. 3 4 Q. The suggestion then in the second statement: 5 "It was agreed at the outset with PIRC that they 6 would revert to us when they wanted statements and when 7 they were clear on the basis that statements were to be 8 given." 9 Was there any agreement with PIRC that PIRC would 10 revert to "us", presumably being the officers or Mr Watson or the Federation, when they wanted 11 12 statements? Was there any such agreement? 13 Not with me. I think I can clearly speak for Α. 14 John McSporran, not from him. As I said earlier, 15 there's a lot -- well, the majority of the correspondence was taking place between the commissioner 16 17 and Mr Mitchell with the Federation, but you know that is just wrong, that is just untrue. You know, it's 18 19 clearly documented the efforts we made to get 20 statements, and for them just to come out with that and 21 what effect that had -- I go back to what effect did 22 that have with regard to the family, and the family perception that we were capable and able to carry out 23 24 an effective investigation, when you have a statement 25 like that to say: well, you only need to -- we had

1 an agreement, just come and tell us when you want 2 statements. It's wrong. 3 Q. What were your concerns about the impact on the family 4 reading this, if they did read this? 5 If they had read that, it would be first question Α. I think: what in the name of goodness has PIRC been 6 7 doing? Because any meetings we had the family we were 8 saying, "Look, we are making best efforts to get 9 statements from the officers, there's challenges that we 10 are having in respect of that", and, you know, for all we could say to them, you know, "We've never came across 11 12 this before we need to overcome this hurdle", and then 13 you have that. And the Federation knew full well and 14 they had correspondence as well around about -- the 15 Federation knew full well that we had been trying since day one to get statements from these officers or an 16 17 operational statement from the officers and then get we 18 would get full statements which is why we ended up just 19 taking full statements, you know. 20 But that is a total misrepresentation of what was

happening and it reflected -- it reflected on --I would -- my viewpoint was this reflected badly on PIRC in the public eye and in the family eye. It could also have a -- it could also have a detrimental effect within our own organisation because we are telling them this is

1		what we're doing, you know, the investigators are out
2		and about doing other stuff, we are making best efforts
3		to get this so keep working away and we will get this
4		and hopefully fill in the gaps. And then what did the
5		public think of that statement? You know, really kind
6		of totally undermining a new organisation, which we were
7		at that time, and making best efforts to take forward
8		the kind of new responsibilities we had been given and
9		then on the other side the family must have just
10		been I don't know what they would have thought of
11		us, to be honest with you.
12	Q.	So from your perspective you had come in on 4 May, you
13		are lead investigator initially and then you are working
14		with Mr McSporran?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	As far as your evidence is concerned, am I right in
17		understanding that you believed that PIRC were making
18		efforts from that point
19	Α.	Oh, absolutely.
20	Q.	to seek statements?
21	A.	Absolutely.
22	Q.	As far as you are concerned, I think on Friday you said
23		that efforts at that time were through Police Scotland?
24	A.	Yes.
25	Q.	Had any direct contact been made with the SPF?

1	_	
1	Α.	Not by me. Not by me personally, no, but I know there
2		was direct dialogue ongoing.
3	Q.	I think did you mention Mr Mitchell might be able to
4	Α.	Mr Mitchell, and the Commissioner Ms Frame was involved
5		in direct dialogue with Mr Watson.
6	Q.	Thank you. Am I right in saying from my understanding
7		of your statement that PIRC actually responded to this
8		statement publicly?
9	Α.	Did I say that? I don't
10	Q.	Are you aware that Mr Mitchell was involved in
11		responding to this statement?
12	Α.	I don't think I said that. I He may well have
13		done, I don't have any recollection at this moment in
14		time.
15	Q.	All right, well I can move on.
16	Α.	Sorry did I actually I thought I said I did not take
17		any action and am unsure if anyone else did. That is
18		161.
19	Q.	Let's look at 161. Do you remember if anyone else did
20		now?
21	Α.	No.
22	Q.	Do you remember if Mr Mitchell took
23	Α.	No, he may well have done, as I said Mr Mitchell was in
24		the main principally liaising with the Federation,
25		Mr Watson in respect to this.

1	Q.	Did anyone have any conversations with yourself or
2		yourself and Mr McSporran about what action should be
3		taken in relation to this?
4	Α.	I don't recall. It may well have done. I am sorry.
5	Q.	Thank you for clarifying that. Can I look at
6		paragraph 29 of your second Inquiry statement. 421,
7		which is the one we are on but go right back to
8		paragraph 29.
9	A.	29. Thank you.
10	Q.	You are asked here:
11		"Did any 'lessons learned' exercise take place
12		following the investigation in relation to the incident
13		involving Mr Bayoh."
14		You are asked to expand on that?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	Your response is:
17		"There was no 'lesson learned' exercise undertaken
18		by PIRC into this investigation. Due to the time for
19		this investigation to be concluded and then move to
20		a Public Inquiry, a management decision was taken not to
21		hold a debrief given the fact that there is this
22		Public Inquiry. Who made that decision I cannot recall.
23		"I do believe that we could have benefitted from
24		such an exercise. In my opinion we can learn something
25		from every investigation."

1 Α. Yes. 2 Can I ask you about some of the different aspects of Q. 3 that response. You said there was no lessons learned 4 exercise. We've heard evidence that on occasion PIRC 5 can do a debrief or a lessons learned exercise after 6 an investigation. Was that your experience also? 7 Α. Yes, yes it is. Do you know why there was no lessons learned exercise in 8 Q. 9 the immediate aftermath of the final report being sent to Crown Office? 10 No. No. No, I don't know. I don't know why it 11 Α. 12 immediately took place. We have a process now that is 13 under the direction of the director of operations who 14 you know who will call a kind of a lessons learned 15 debrief which includes everybody who has been involved in it, and -- and others who may not have been involved 16 17 in it who maybe have a contribution to make. But no, I can't -- I can't recall that, you know. 18 19 Bearing in mind when the report had gone in we -- you 20 know we -- (a) the workload had increased quite 21 dramatically and we immediately almost moved into the M9 22 situation. But, no. After the report had been sent to the Crown --23 Q. 24 Α. Yes. -- do you remember anything resembling a lessons learned 25 Q.

1		exercise or debrief at that time?
2	Α.	No, no, not a not a no.
3	Q.	You have said there it would be a management decision.
4		You have talked about the would it be the director
5		of
6	Α.	At this time it is the director of operations.
7	Q.	operations?
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	And then at the point where you issued the final report
10		to the Crown, who would have been responsible for
11		organising a lessons learned exercise or a debrief?
12	Α.	That would have been a discussion, Mr Mitchell was the
13		director, I can't remember if he had moved from director
14		of investigations you know, his title changed, he got
15		a bigger portfolio, I think that is why it changed. But
16		he was the director of operations and John was obviously
17		the SIO in respect of that. But there was no lessons
18		learned exercise undertaken.
19	Q.	Thank you. You say:
20		"I do believe that we could have benefitted from
21		such an exercise."
22		Can you tell us a little more why that is your
23		belief and whether you have had any experiences of
24		benefit being gained after this type of exercise in the
25		past in other cases?

1 Α. Yes, yes. Yes. As I said we do -- I am saying "we" although I am not in the organisation. PIRC does have 2 3 and a kind of structure in place for, you know, a formal 4 debrief, a lessons learned exercise, and we talk through 5 different aspects of it. You know, I was involved in one although I wasn't part of the -- the actual 6 7 investigation and particularly what happened in day one 8 but the incident occurred at the Park Inn, the fatal 9 shooting that occurred there and then we held a debrief 10 in respect of that. There was some areas come out round about that, exactly what, I can't remember, but that is 11 12 an example, I am giving is I was invited to provide some 13 contribution if I could, or commentary if I could, just 14 based on being one of the PIRC's senior investigators.

15 From that we had another debrief that I was involved in where I was the lead investigator on another shooting 16 17 where shots were discharged by Police Scotland and thankfully they missed, and so there was a discussion 18 all around about that aspect. And there was lessons 19 20 learned in respect of the management of the scene 21 and the handover of the scene at that one, and also in 22 respect of the Gold Group and who was actually the lead SIO in respect of the police side and just making sure 23 lines of communication. 24

25

So there are two examples of fairly high profile

1		investigations and we sat down and we sat for
2		an afternoon, I can't remember how long it was, but
3		there was an agenda drafted up to cover each of the
4		points. Not to identify it but to cover the areas that
5		people were covering, whether it be the initial
6		attendance, the initial call, the scene management, the
7		PIM process, the interviewing. You know, so we do have
8		that now. But didn't do it then.
9	Q.	Could I ask you sorry, you've mentioned the M9 FAI?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Were you involved in that PIRC investigation?
12	Α.	No, I was still dealing in principle dealing with
13		this or I was dealing with other deaths as well. But
14		I wasn't the M9.
15	Q.	From the work that you have done in PIRC are you aware
16		if there was ever a lessons learned exercise in the M9
17		investigation that PIRC carried out?
18	Α.	Not to my recollection. There may have been, but not to
19		my recollection.
20	Q.	Thank you. I would like to move on and ask you some
21		questions that all relate to the investigation itself
22		and the adequacy of the investigation as such. You will
23		know that Article 2 requires the investigation to be
24		adequate?
25	A.	Yes.

1	Q.	That is one of the five principles that are required.
2		Can I ask you first of all about statements. You were
3		obviously lead investigator from 4 May?
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	And then became deputy to John McSporran?
6	Α.	That is correct.
7	Q.	Can I ask you to look at your statement 421 at
8		paragraph 168. Paragraph 168.
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	We will get that on the scene. You were asked in
11		relation to officers
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	that the PIRC investigation did not take statements
14		from. You were specifically referred to
15		DCI Keith Hardie, DS Lesley Boal and Inspector
16		Stephen Kay?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	I think your response here is:
19		"Operational statements were requested from all
20		police officers involved in any aspect of the incident.
21		Only if the information supplied was lacking in detail
22		or required further clarification or missing certain
23		information was it deemed necessary to raise an action
24		for that officer to be re-interviewed."
25		Is an action a phrase where you it's a request

1		effectively
2	Α.	Yes, an instruction.
3	Q.	An instruction. Thank you:
4		"Similarly if a witness had a statement taken from
5		[them] by a police officer I would not [have] asked for
6		that witness statement to be re-seen by a PIRC
7		investigator as a matter of routine but only if
8		I required further detail/clarification on certain
9		points. It is not practical to have PIRC re-interview
10		every witness as a matter of course."
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	Does this relate to pressure on resources and the number
13		of people you have available?
14	Α.	No, I wouldn't say it is related to that. It actually
15		relates to the requirement and the need to re-interview
16		that person. As I said, an action is an instruction.
17		It is an action raised in a system and the instruction
18		is when it's actually allocated to somebody to go and
19		undertake that action.
20	Q.	Can I ask you about we can see the names at the top
21		of the screen?
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	If I can ask you to begin by thinking about Inspector
24		Stephen Kay. We have heard evidence from Inspector Kay.
25		He was a temporary inspector on 3 May 2015 acting as

1		Police Incident Officer, PIO, and he was listening to
2		calls and he later attended the incident at
3		Hayfield Road. He was mentioned and heard on the
4		Airwaves. Why was there no statement taken from him?
5	A.	He did he not provide a statement? Now, I am
6		surmising here because I can't specifically remember.
7	Q.	The question presupposes that he was not actually asked
8		any questions by PIRC. So you think you had enough
9		information from Inspector Kay without the need for PIRC
10		to go back to speak to him personally?
11	A.	Without having without reading the statement at this
12		moment in time and seeing what kind of action was raised
13		in respect of that statement, if any action was raised,
14		then, I'm sorry, I can't comment upon that.
15	Q.	Right. I will come back to that. Can we move on to
16		Keith Hardie.
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	He was the single point of contact. He was with MIT?
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	He wasn't at the scene?
21	A.	No.
22	Q.	We have heard from him. But he was involved, trying to
23		get statements from the officers. He spoke to officers
24		at Kirkcaldy Police Office requesting statements?
25	A.	Yes.

1	Q.	He attended the post mortem. He was present during the
2		meeting, as you have said, where you discussed the
3		decision to disclose the interim results of the
4		post mortem. Why did PIRC not take any statement from
5		him?
6	Α.	Did Mr Hardie not supply a statement?
7	Q.	So is this another example of: he has given a statement
8		and a view has been taken that no further detail is
9		required?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Can I ask you about Lesley Boal.
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	I think she was Chief Superintendent actually?
14	Α.	She was, yes.
15	Q.	Yes. She was involved on 3 May?
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	I think she we have heard evidence from her she
18		appointed Campbell as SIO?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	She was the senior officer involved with attending
21		Gold Group meetings on the day of 3 May and she was
22		party to various discussions that day?
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	Again, do you know why PIRC did not speak to her and ask
25		for a statement?

1 Α. We did ask her for a statement. She provided a statement. What I do remember about Ms Boal is she 2 3 was not involved in any evidence aspects. She was not 4 the SIO. She appointed the SIO. She was not involved 5 in the decision-making. She in-gathered no evidence, if I remember correctly, and the only -- I am saying "the 6 7 only", this is again to my recollection, the only part 8 on 3rd that I can recall that she played is she was involved with the SIO in drafting a death message. 9 10 Q. Yes, we have heard that evidence. Yes. So really I think Ms Boal, when we asked her for 11 Α. 12 a statement -- so she wasn't a priority statement, you 13 know. She wasn't somebody you're needing a statement 14 from because, as I said, she is not involved in the 15 evidence side of things, and when she provided a statement -- yes. I can remember Ms Boal's statement 16 17 as well, is the incident room -- the statements come in 18 and they go into the incident room. I think I explained 19 on Friday that I created a -- and I tried to put in 20 place a structure and put in a MIR. So the statements 21 go into the MIR and the office manager and the statement 22 reader, he would read the statements and he would identify areas that he thinks need to be covered and 23 hands -- now, these areas may actually have been covered 24 by somebody else, so you don't need that. And 25

1 I remember with Ms Boal's statement is, although the action was raised for a re-interview of Ms Boal is 2 3 I deferred it on a number of occasions, because I didn't 4 see the -- there was other things more important needing 5 done than Ms Boal being seen, as I said, because she is not in the evidence chain. And I recall then I -- I use 6 7 a phrase "I referred it". Again, these are terms within 8 the CLUE management system. I referred that and 9 I think, if I remember correctly -- you will be able to 10 look at the action -- my rationale for referring that one is we have now submitted the report to Crown, we 11 12 haven't re-interviewed Ms Boal because, again, it was my 13 decision that she wasn't forming part of the evidence 14 chain and if they wished -- if Crown wished Ms Boal 15 re-interviewed, then they would get back to us. Now, Crown did come back to us about a number of people to be 16 17 re-interviewed, one of them being Garry McEwan. Was 18 Stephen Kay not part that? I don't know, sorry. I'm just thinking off the top of my head and trying to --19 20 but Ms Boal was not -- Crown did not come back to us. 21 And Crown is like a fail-safe. We work under 22 instruction by Crown, we send a report to Crown, we send the statements to Crown and if there is an area that 23 Crown feel we have not covered correctly, then they will 24 25 come back to us and instruct us to undertake these

1		enquiries. And that's happened in every big
2		investigation I've ever worked on within the police and
3		when I was down in the States of Jersey and this, and
4		other PIRC investigations.
5	Q.	So PIRC treat Crown as a I think the phrased used was
6		"fail-safe"?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	If there is anything missed or that needs clarified, you
9		would expect Crown to come back and make a request?
10	Α.	Yes. Likewise, if there is further instruction required
11		that I am aware they had a Crown counsel working
12		that, because I did meet her, you know, in relation to
13		aspects of the investigation. Yes, so
14	Q.	Thank you. You obviously recollect that Lesley Boal was
15		involved in drafting a death message?
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	You understood I think when you became lead investigator
18		that there were concerns expressed by the family
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	about the differing information that was given to the
21		family
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	in delivery of the death messages on 3 May. Did you
24		consider that that alone merited a further discussion
25		with Lesley Boal or not?

1	A.	I can't remember how Ms Boal covered that in her
2		operational statement, and I can't remember if that was
3		one of the aspects that the officer manager identified
4		during the kind of examination of the statement.
5		I don't recall that. Again, I will go back to what
6		I just explained there; if that was a failing and
7		lacking, then I'm surprised that Crown didn't come back
8		to us and ask us to to re-interview Ms Boal.
9		Crown do have the option to precognosce as well, you
10		know, so
11	Q.	So is it somewhat reassuring that you don't remember
12		that aspect being sent back to PIRC for further
13	A.	I don't know about reassuring. It is we weren't
14		asked to re-interview Ms Boal, so, you know.
15	Q.	Can I move on to Kevin Nelson?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	I think PIRC took two statements from Kevin Nelson?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	We have heard from Mr Nelson. He gave evidence to the
20		Inquiry and we heard that he was he lived in the
21		area?
22	A.	He did.
23	Q.	He lived his house was close to the scene and to some
24		extent he was an eyewitness to the events?
25	Α.	Yes.

1	Q.	We have also heard from PC Tomlinson and PC Walker about
2		an alleged stamp
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	which Mr Bayoh stamped on Nicole Short, and that
5		would have been information available to you on
6		4 June 2015.
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	I think Kevin Nelson's PIRC statements were 5 May, so
9		within a couple of days of the incident, and then
10		26 August, a number of months later. Now, when PIRC
11		went back to speak to Mr Nelson the second time in
12		the August, there was no attempt to ask him questions in
13		relation to whether he had seen a stamp?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	I think you have been asked about this. You have
16		mentioned that in your Inquiry statement?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	Which I think is at paragraph 169. Can we have a look
19		at that.
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	You say there:
22		"I did not think it was necessary for this witness
23		to be re-interviewed. It is clear from his statement
24		taken by Investigator Pattenden that after he (Nelson)
25		stated that he saw the deceased punch PC Short he left

1		his viewpoint from his front window and had no sight of
2		the altercation until about 10-20 seconds later when he
3		entered his front garden and stood at his front gate.
4		By this time the deceased is being restrained on the
5		ground by the police."
6		So did you have a conversation with
7		Investigator Pattenden?
8	A.	Yes, I did. I did, and that was just shortly after the
9		statement had been taken. Obviously the information
10		that Mr Nelson provided was very relevant and very
11		crucial. He's the only independent witness to any
12		assault on a police officer. Yes. So I asked her
13		about you know, the taking of the statement.
14	Q.	I think earlier this morning you mentioned that you knew
15		about the punch?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	The first statement from Mr Nelson was 5 May?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	So would it have been from Mr Nelson
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	that you became aware of the punch? Alleged punch.
22		You say in your opinion from that conversation with
23		Investigator Pattenden Mr Nelson wasn't in a position to
24		see the events that occurred after the punch. Was that
25		your impression at the time?

1	A.	Yes. I maybe should have that occurred immediately
2		after the punch. He obviously he saw because he
3		was able to view once he got to his front gate and he
4		gave us information regarding that.
5	Q.	You found out from Investigator Pattenden that she had
6		walked the route effectively with him from his window
7	Α.	Yes, she had timed it. Yes.
8	Q.	to his gate? It had been timed.
9	Α.	And his hedges were high.
10	Q.	Sorry
11	Α.	His hedges were high. Kareen commented on that. His
12		hedges were high.
13	Q.	Yes, and it comments there specifically:
14		"Having taken the route from the front window and
15		confirmed the time taken, given the height of the hedges
16		he would have been unable to see anything that was
17		occurring at street level until he reached his garden
18		gate."
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	His second statement taken by Investigator Pattenden was
21		26 August.
22	A.	Mm-hmm.
23	Q.	And the events took place on 3 May. I am wondering
24		about the height of the hedges on 3 May. It seems to be
25		that a view has been taken about the height of the

1 hedges based on their height in August -- at the end of August rather than what position they were in on 2 3 3 May. 4 Α. No, my -- no, my recollection of the conversation with 5 Kareen is Kareen had walked to see the viewpoint of Mr Nelson. Kareen is a tall lady, you know. I don't 6 7 know the height of Mr Nelson, but she is a tall lady 8 so -- but she did make mention of the fact that she 9 couldn't see over the hedges until you got to the gate. 10 Q. And did she make mention of what height the hedges were on 3 May? If there had been any change between 3 May 11 12 and 26 August --13 Sorry, my apologies. Between 3 and 5 May? Sorry, I'm Α. 14 getting a wee bit confused here. 15 Q. The 3 May is the incident, 5 May is when he gives his first Inquiry statement. 16 Yes, right. Okay. 17 Α. Then 26 August is when Investigator Pattenden is 18 Q. 19 carrying out this -- as I understand it, carrying out 20 this timing of the journey from the window to the gate. 21 I am interested in the height of the hedges. 22 Essentially I am wondering did they grow during that 23 period? No, I recall having a discussion with Kareen after she 24 Α. 25 had taken the first statement from this witness, because

1		he was an eyewitness to part of the events that happened
2		here, and I remember having the discussion with her in
3		respect of of how you know, what did she do in
4		relation to the statement? Did she just sit down and
5		take the statement? She said, "No, no, I walked it,
6		Billy. I kind of walked the route to see what he could
7		see. I took how long it would take to walk through"
8		Now, whether
9	Q.	So this was after the first statement had been taken
10	Α.	My recollection is this is after the first statement.
11	Q.	So that was after 5 May?
12	Α.	After 5 May, yes.
13	Q.	So when you say at the start of this:
14		"I did not think it necessary for this witness to be
15		re-interviewed"
16		He was re-interviewed on 26 August. Am I wrong in
17		assuming that this is
18	Α.	But he was re-interviewed on 6 August in relation to
19		a different aspect, not in respect of his of his
20		view. If I remember rightly, and I haven't read his
21		statement for a long time, is we re-interviewed him as
22		the result of people calling at his door seeking to get
23		information from him.
24	Q.	So you didn't re-interview him after 5 May to ask him
25		

1	A.	No, no.
2	Q.	And you didn't re-interview him after 5 May to discuss
3		the hedges at all?
4	A.	No.
5	Q.	Or his viewpoint
6	A.	No.
7	Q.	at that stage. It was a completely separate matter?
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	So why didn't you re-interview him after you got the
10		police officers' statements on 4 June?
11	A.	Because I didn't think it was necessary because of the
12		information that Kareen had in-gathered, and how she had
13		in-gathered that information.
14	Q.	On the basis that you assumed he couldn't see or hadn't
15		seen events?
16	Α.	Well, he couldn't see because he said himself he
17		witnessed the altercation between Mr Bayoh and
18		Nicole Short and then left his viewpoint and travelled
19		through his house to his front door, out through his
20		front garden and up to his garden gate.
21	Q.	And you didn't think it worthy of clarification
22	A.	No.
23	Q.	if he had seen a stamp or anything of
24	A.	No.
25	MS	GRAHAME: Right. I am going to move on. I appreciate

1	I have said we will come back to a couple of points
2	which we will see if we can get hard copies over lunch.
3	I wonder if that might be an appropriate point to
4	rise for lunch?
5	LORD BRACADALE: Very well. We will stop for lunch and sit
6	at 2 o'clock.
7	(12.55 pm)
8	(The short adjournment)
9	(2.00 pm)
10	LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
11	MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Mr Little, before lunch I was
12	taking you through some statements but we didn't have
13	heard copies. I think you have now been provided with
14	hard copies, they should be in your blue folder. I am
15	going to begin by looking at Kevin Nelson's statement
16	which is PIRC 00019.
17	A. Thank you.
18	Q. This is we have heard evidence from Mr Nelson. It's
19	a statement that was taken on 5 May 2015 at 19.00 hours.
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. It was taken by Kareen Pattenden, we spoke about her
22	before lunch.
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. He was a key eyewitness, I think you said?
25	A. Yes.

1	Q.	He was one of only two civilian witnesses to the
2		incident, Ashley Wyse and Kevin Nelson?
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	Now, we have heard evidence from Ashley Wyse that she
5		gave an initial statement on 3 May and then PIRC went
6		back and spoke to her on 5 May.
7	A.	Okay.
8	Q.	Looking at Kevin Nelson's statement we see he was spoken
9		to by PIRC on 5 May.
10	A.	Mm-hmm.
11	Q.	But he was not they didn't go back PIRC didn't go
12		back to speak to him until 26 August
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	after that. I was wondering why after the
15		officers gave statements on 4 June why there was no
16		return to Mr Nelson to maybe explore in further detail
17		issues regarding the incident once you were aware of
18		what the officers were saying?
19	Α.	I think the after the officers gave the statement
20		that the area that was that was not, say,
21		potentially not covered in Mr Nelson's statement was in
22		relation to the alleged stamp on PC Short. I think the
23		first statement sorry, I have not had a chance to
24		read it here, I think in the first statement it is
25		mentioned that he saw Mr Bayoh punching the police

1		officer, who we know to be Nicole Short.
2	Q.	That is correct, page 3.
3	Α.	I think he mentions more than one punch, I think.
4	Q.	He does.
5	A.	I can't remember if he said they all struck or not.
6	Q.	It's on page 3, you can actually see it at the bottom of
7		the page there:
8		"I believe he struck at her with his closed fists at
9		least three times."
10		That is the section of the statement. So he
11		commented on the punch or the "lunge", as he put it, in
12		his first statement, the one on 5 May.
13	Α.	So reading that there and after he says:
14		" with his closed fists at least three times.
15		I heard her scream out so I cannot be positive but
16		I believe that at least one of those fists struck her."
17		That was the point I was~
18		He then says:
19		"At this point I decided to go to the front garden
20		to have a closer look. I do not know why I did this
21		other than being curious."
22		So he left his front window to make his way to his
23		front door to go out into his front garden:
24		"I believe it may have taken me 10-20 seconds~"
25		That's a fairly big time gap:

1 "I exited my house ... and stood looking over my 2 gate. At this time the black male now appeared to be face down on the pavement." 3 4 So he is telling us there he hasn't seen the stamp, 5 he has not had the opportunity to -- you know, by omission there he has not had the opportunity to see the 6 7 stamp because he said himself he left from the window he was looking out of and he made his way through his house 8 and out his front door into the garden, so ... 9 10 Q. I am wondering --I understand the point you are saying, so why didn't we 11 Α. 12 go and actually get that written down in writing. 13 I understand what you are saying. But the decision was 14 saying well, we don't need that. The statement -- the 15 statement covers why he can't see the stamp, the alleged 16 stamp. The statement covers that. I suppose I am wondering why you didn't think it might 17 Q. 18 be worthwhile to go back and ask him specifically if he 19 had seen the stamp. It may have assisted the officers 20 to know that there had been a stamp, an alleged stamp by Mr Bayoh --21 The principal officers? 22 Α. 23 Yes. Q. I wouldn't have told them that. 24 Α.

25 Q. I am not asking you if you would have told them that --

1	Α.	I wouldn't have told them that.
2	Q.	but obviously you are investigating the
3		circumstances, whether they favour Mr Bayoh or they
4		favour the officers, and it may be that this sort of
5		information might have favoured the officers. You have
6		talked about justifications for use of force
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	things happened after these events, would it not have
9		been worthwhile to go back and perhaps put to
10		Mr Nelson: we've heard we've got statements from
11		officers, they mention a stamp. Did you see anything of
12		that sort?
13	Α.	At the time the decision was made not to go and
14		re-interview him because we felt it was covered by quite
15		clearly covered in his statement. We also had the
16		opportunity when there was an additional statement taken
17		off him, but as I said my recollection of that
18		statement again, I think it is in here but I haven't
19		read it was that that was in relation to shall we
20		say another matter. Not with the events of 3 May.
21		Events that occurred later, you know.
22		So I know I know but gain, I'll go back to the
23		phrase I used on Friday, we are sitting here in
24		hindsight but at that time and that information to me
25		that was quite clear that he couldn't see the stamp.

1 Okay, he couldn't see the stamp. 2 Having gone back at a later stage, you've got a copy of Q. 3 26 August statement, I know you've not had the chance it 4 read it, but it doesn't cover any of this information. 5 No, no that was my recollection, it doesn't. Α. Looking back now, do you think that might have been 6 Q. 7 an opportunity to discuss the versions you had had from 8 the officers with him to get more information from him, or did you think that wasn't necessary? 9 10 Α. Obviously sitting now with you questioning me on this matter, then yes it was an opportunity to do that but 11 12 the decision at the time was that it wasn't felt 13 necessary to do that, because to me it is quite clear in 14 there is he looks out the window, he sees three punches 15 being thrown, he thinks one connects and then he leaves. He talks about curiosity, he then leaves and he is not 16 in a position to see what is happening outside. 17 All right. Thank you. Sticking with Mr Nelson's first 18 Q. 19 statement, 5 May, so this is two days after the incident 20 before you got statements from the officers. 21 Α. Yes. 22 Do you have that one? Q. Yes, sorry, 19. 23 Α. 24 Q. Could you look at page 2 of that statement. Down 25 towards the bottom, it says:

"When this male started walking along the road he appeared to be acting as if the police were not talking to him. He ignored everything that was being said. My view was clear, I would say the male was about 30 yards from me and at this time he did not appear to be carrying anything in either of his hands."

Now, you have given evidence that on 5 May the
briefing was still being used, the briefing paper which
made mention of he was holding a knife above his hands
going towards the officers. Do you remember looking at
the briefing paper?

12 A. Yes.

When you saw this paragraph in Mr Nelson's statement to 13 Q. 14 PIRC, what action did you take? Because up until that 15 point the briefing was that Mr Bayoh was holding -clearly seen to be holding a knife at Hayfield Road. 16 17 This seems to be a contradictory statement from one of 18 the key eyewitnesses saying he wasn't holding anything 19 in either of his hands. Did you take any steps in 20 relation to that?

A. Well, that was us now in the process of what the
investigators do, we had next to no information on the
3rd. I was provided with a briefing paper on 4th that
contained what we now know to be inaccurate information,
then the investigatory process is to in gather

1 the evidence and identify, and this obviously -- when I read this, I don't know if I read this -- I doubt --2 3 it was 5 May, 19.00, so that is when they started taking 4 that statement. So I wouldn't have read this until the 5 very earliest 6 May or maybe even 7 May, once it had been processed through the incident room. But, yes, 6 7 I absolutely agree with you. That is then now telling 8 us that we have an eyewitness who says he wasn't 9 carrying anything in his hands when the police first 10 engaged with him. So, yes. Can I just be clear about one point. You may have read 11 Q. 12 this statement at a subsequent event. What about 13 the conversation you had with Investigator Pattenden? 14 How long after she took this statement did you discuss 15 Kevin Nelson with her? Because, as you have said, he was a key eyewitness. Did she raise or draw to your 16 17 attention this issue about the knife and Mr Nelson not seeing anything in his hands? 18 19 I can't recall that aspect of it, I can't recall, sorry. Α. 20 And you know I did discuss with her the statement 21 because it is -- you know, saying he was a key witness, one of the only eyewitnesses we have to the incident, 22 23 independent eyewitnesses.

Q. Would you have expected her to draw that type of thingto your attention?

1	A.	I would have, you know, but likewise you have to see
2		things in writing, written down to know it's in
3		evidence, it has been captured.
4	Q.	So even if Ms Pattenden had said, "I've taken
5		a statement from Mr Nelson at 7 o'clock tonight, he
6		voluntarily gave that statement", you would want to see
7		it in writing before you relied on it?
8	Α.	But it was there was nothing to rely on, we had we
9		had a briefing paper and that is it's a brief. It's
10		brief information to give a kind of outline of what has
11		happened. You know, we later identified that
12		information within it was inaccurate. That, whilst
13		disappointing, on reflection is not a huge surprise
14		because the key the principal officers had given no
15		statements, they had made no initial accounts, they had
16		provided no basic facts. So we are working on
17		information there that yes, while you would have
18		expected it to be reliable, you have to take the caveat
19		that nobody had provided any evidence as I would
20		describe, and actually the PIM didn't hand us basic
21		facts, the PIM didn't hand us initial accounts, so
22		officers didn't provide statements.
23		So this to me is all part of investigatory process

23 So this, to me, is all part of investigatory process 24 and all part of evidence-gathering, and then actually 25 analysing the evidence and seeing where that evidence is

1		taking us, which as an investigator is what we would do.
2	Q.	Thank you. Before lunch we also spoke about
3		Inspector Stephen Kay.
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	We have provided with you a hard copy of his statement.
6		This is PS-00345.
7	A.	Sorry, I have got the wrong one. I am looking at
8		a follow-up statement.
9	Q.	No, not at all.
10	A.	Yes, thank you.
11	Q.	This is a self-penned statement.
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	It is undated.
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	We have heard evidence from Inspector Kay that we
16		heard evidence from him on 23 November 2022 and his
17		evidence was that this self-penned statement was
18		prepared within a week after the events.
19	A.	Okay, yes.
20	Q.	And, as I said before lunch, he was the PIO?
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	We have heard evidence he was listening to Airwaves in
23		real time when the incident was taking place, and
24		I think you see at the bottom of page 1 that he mentions
25		that he was PIO for the following day's business?

1 A. Yes.

2	Q.	And that took him on to 3 May. If we can move on to
3		page 2, please. We have heard evidence from
4		Inspector Kay and we also have the benefit of Airwaves
5		transmissions which show that the police arrived at
6		Hayfield Road at 7.20 and 23 seconds in the morning, and
7		Inspector Kay arrived at 7.40 and 54 seconds. There is
8		an Airwaves transmission from him saying, "I have just
9		arrived".
10	A.	Okay.
11	Q.	So he was the PIO in regard to this incident and on
12		page 2, if we look at paragraph I think 6, or it
13		starts:
14		"I then heard on radio transmissions"
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	" that more calls had been received regarding this
17		male brandishing a knife at vehicles and was still
18		walking about the streets At this time I heard
19		[Acting Police Sergeant] Maxwell request an armed
20		response vehicle and dog unit to attend due to the
21		severity of the reports."
22		We have heard evidence that they were grade 1,
23		immediate threat to life:
24		"This request was not acknowledged and it took
25		several attempts to receive an acknowledgement stating

1 contact was made.

"I immediately realised this was a very serious 2 3 report of which officers safety and the public safety 4 was at risk." 5 Then: "I was aware via radio that PCs Paton and Walker had 6 7 arrived at Hayfield Road and had the suspect in sight. 8 Almost immediately I became aware of the emergency 9 button on the Airwave terminal being activated. I then heard shouts for assistance similar to officer down and 10 an officer was injured, possibly PC Short." 11 12 So he was listening in the calls, the Airwave 13 transmissions as it was happening, he was aware it was 14 very serious, and officer and public safety was at risk. 15 You have told us about the difficulties with Airwave transmissions and collecting them and gathering them in. 16 17 Would it have been worthwhile going back to Inspector Kay, in light of his involvement in the 18 incident and his role as PIO, to flesh out some of the 19 20 details involved in what had happened and the course of 21 events? Because at this moment in time you don't have 22 police statements. 23 A. I would say possibly in respect to that. But you have to bear in mind that we have got all these other aspects 24

that we are looking at, you know we are not the biggest

25

1 team, I think the other day I identified principal roles and that took up about 20 of our staff. So it was one 2 3 of the points that was always at the back of the mind, 4 who have I actually got to go out and do enquiries 5 because I have got CCTV, I have house-to-house team, 6 I have got people dealing with -- the post mortem is 7 over but we are now deal with the SPA, productions --Crime scene management? 8 Q. Crime scene management, ingathering information there, 9 Α. 10 we've got our office up and running, and trying to 11 ensure we put in place the kind of protocols within the 12 kind of office. So there is really, really time 13 critical investigations you've got to do or you will 14 lose evidence. So take this one aspect in hindsight, 15 and saying why didn't we go and take that, is -- I can't 16 answer that definitively just now why not. Okay? But as I said, we had -- you've only got the resources 17 18 you've got, you have to make the best use of them. You 19 know house-to-house is really, really important because 20 you may spring up another Kevin Nelson, another 21 Ashley Wyse, so we have to ensure that getting done. 22 People aren't just sitting in their houses waiting for 23 us to arrive, so you are spending a lot of time back and forth to different houses trying to get somebody in, 24 trying to get some response. 25

1 So I understand your question and I am -- but to me 2 it is being taken in isolation and actually, you know, actually how do you do this, you know. Now, whether 3 4 that was a rationale for not doing it at the time -- we 5 didn't do it, you know, I presume by your questioning -and I can't remember Stephen Kay, I can't remember his 6 7 statement -- we did go and take another statement from him, I see there. It was actually myself that took that 8 9 statement because that caught my eye when he were doing 10 that. That was on 12 January 2017. 11 Q. 12 I go back to just before lunch when I say I think Α. Stephen Kay was one of the officers identified by Crown 13 to -- for a re-examination. 14 15 Q. Right. Yes, so that was an instruction from Crown and I think 16 Α. there was a kind of -- Crown had a wee bit of a 17 catch-all, you know, and you are looking for Crown to 18 19 kind of, you know~... 20 But I don't think that was one of the aspects. It 21 wasn't. One of the aspects we were going back to speak 22 to him about was about a briefing regarding threats that 23 had been raised, apparently. It was to try to establish that. So with regard to your question, no, it is 24 obviously not something we've done, otherwise you 25

1 wouldn't be questioning me on it, but Crown haven't 2 asked for it either. Q. You've explained on Friday about issues with the 3 4 resourcing. I am wondering would you have -- if you had 5 had the opportunity or had the resources to appoint 6 someone to go through statements as they were coming in 7 and identify possibly further useful lines of enquiry, is that suggest would have liked to have had? 8 I did have somebody doing that --9 Α. 10 Q. Who ---- Ian Macintyre was doing that. There was only 11 Α. 12 Ian Macintyre and Laura White plus admin support because 13 the statements got typed into CLUE, the statements are 14 written statements and then they are typed into the CLUE 15 system at that time. And Ian was -- part of the function within a major incident room is you will have 16 17 a statement reader or a number of statement readers who 18 will go through the statement and they will identify areas that will -- you know, that potentially need 19 20 further examination. So there was somebody doing that. 21 Q. But he didn't think in relation to this statement that 22 there should be any further actions? 23 Well, obviously not because there is no further action Α. to do. It is not like -- I am presuming and again, we 24 are all these years later, I presume there has not been 25

1 an action raised like there was for Lesley Boal and 2 I have referred it or deferred it, you know. So 3 obviously not. But in defence of Ian and such like, 4 there is three people in an incident room, I think my 5 last major investigation when I was in the police, 6 a Cat A murder, we would have about a dozen people in 7 the incident room. Doing that job of reading statements --8 Q. Doing different jobs. You've got an office manager, an 9 Α. 10 action allocator, a statement reader, a researcher. You've all these kind of functions, okay. We are -- we 11 12 are -- we were multitasking here. So -- so I am not --13 I am not saying I agree with you here in respect of --14 yes, I agree would that not have been a good idea but 15 you have to say right what is the priorities, what are 16 we trying to focus on, and at that time when this 17 statement came in and when we actually got possession of 18 it, you know although it is -- he penned it on -- did 19 you say the 5th or the 6th or something? I said his evidence was that it was penned within a week 20 Q. 21 of the events. 22 Okay, but when did it come to us? Because you know, Α. 23 did it come directly to us the day after he penned it? Remember I talked about this transition of information 24 coming to us, it's not just a case of: there you go, 25

1		there's your information. There's a transition of
2		information and Ian Macintyre, as office manager, was
3		meeting with his counterpart to get information passed
4		over.
5	Q.	How long would you expect a self-penned statement from
6		a PIO to reach PIRC?
7	A.	It depends on the size of the investigation, I have to
8		say.
9	Q.	In this case?
10	A.	He has not penned it he is saying he has penned it
11		within a week, so there we're talking seven days, from
12		a PIO. You know, we serve notice on Police Scotland
13		that we want the information, it would have been
14		operational statements from all officers, you know, you
15		will have that letter in your system, when I think it
16		went on the 6th, or the 5th, it went. So that is us
17		serving notice on the police: you need to give us this.
18		So just because an officer said they penned that
19		statement, it doesn't mean we actually get physical of
20		that statement to read it and examine it and decide what
21		is to happen.
22	Q.	So when would you expect a self-penned statement from
23		a PIO to reach
24	A.	I would expect it as soon as possible from a PIO. Yes.
25		But how long is that? You know, an example given he is

1		saying he did it within seven days, so it could be say
2		the 11th before he has typed it up.
3	Q.	You didn't have statements from the officers at this
4		time?
5	Α.	No.
6	Q.	Could you look at page 3. You've explained the
7		difficulties that caused for PIRC. Do we see on page 3
8		that Mr Kay was he attended the incident at
9		Hayfield Road, he was there about 7.40 and 54 seconds
10		and we see there he said:
11		"I was then further briefed by [Acting
12		Police Sergeant Maxwell]~"
13		And you will see a section within his statement, if
14		we can move up the page, where he talks about who was
15		initially involved, he names officers, what they were
16		doing, they were:
17		" holding the male down by asserting their body
18		weight onto the male at various points, which is
19		a recognised method of gaining control."
20		And he talks about things that Maxwell informed him.
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	" the male ran at officers and was given the command
23		to stop and get back! After a similar command and the
24		male refusing, officers deployed their PAVA and
25		CS spray, but the male displayed no effects and did not

1 stop and kicked PC Short to the ground by swiping her legs thereafter kicking her to the head." 2 3 And he was restrained in leg restraints. 4 Now, leaving aside for one moment issues about 5 whether that is accurate or not, there was obviously a discussion between Kay and Maxwell, Maxwell was the 6 7 acting police sergeant for the response team that day, 8 would it have been worthwhile -- looking at it now in 9 hindsight, would it have been worthwhile, in the absence 10 of having statements from the officers, going back to Kay and maybe fleshing out more detail with regard to 11 12 what Maxwell had been saying? 13 As I think I said earlier, I can't disagree with that Α. sitting here now. 14 15 Q. Not disagreeing with me now, does that mean that you agree that that would have been helpful to the 16 17 investigation if someone had had a further conversation 18 with Inspector Kay? 19 Yes. Α. Thank you. Can we move on to -- just for completeness 20 Q. 21 really, moving on to the statement that Keith Hardie gave. This was dated 27 May 2015, I think you had 22 mentioned it before lunch. Detective Chief Inspector 23 24 Hardie. It's PS00667. And you see it says it's again a self-penned statement written on 27 May 2015. I think 25

1 as you said before lunch, it mentions him attending the 2 mortuary? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. It mentions him having a meeting with you on 5 May, and 5 it mentions him receiving a request from PIRC to make contact with all officers who were known to be involved 6 7 in the arrest of Mr Bayoh and establish whether they 8 were willing to provide an operational statement? 9 Yes. Α. 10 Q. And that related to all of the officers. As you see 11 during his -- that is a statement that he prepared. 12 It's three pages long. I think you said before lunch 13 that you didn't feel that there was any more detail, 14 further detail required from DCI Hardie in that regard? 15 Α. That is my recollection, yes. Then you mentioned minutes of the forensic strategy 16 Q. 17 meeting and I think we have provided with you a hard 18 copy of those. 19 Thank you. Α. 20 This is PIRC 04161. It was a meeting dated -- a minute Q. 21 taken on 12 May at 14.40 and there's a number of people 22 listed as being present including yourself, Mr McSporran, and a number of other investigators and 23 24 the pathologist, Kerryanne Shearer. 25 Α. Yes.

And others from different departments. 1 Q. 2 That is correct. Α. Q. Can I ask you to look at item 4, please, which is on 3 4 page 3. I think you ... sorry. Sorry, item 5 actually, 5 subheading 4. It's this page, page 3. Item 5 in this meeting was, "Forensic examination 6 7 and priorities", and number 4 says: 8 "PC Nicole Short's body armour to be examined for 9 possible footprint." Do you see that? 10 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. "Any footprint found to be compared with deceased's 13 footwear which was seized at Victoria Royal Infirmary, 14 Kirkcaldy at the time of recovery of the body." 15 It mentions the left boot, the right boot and Nicole Short's vest and it mentions photographs were to 16 17 be taken. So this was obviously part of the discussion at the meeting? 18 19 Yes. Α. 20 Was this indicative of the outcome and the result of the Q. discussion? So was it a discussion about the items 21 22 and then a decision taken that the body armour, as it is called there, or the vest as we have known it, is to be 23 24 examined for a footprint? Was that the instruction that 25 was given to the forensic scientist?

1	A.	No, that is a discussion about how best to a minute
2		of how best to proceed with the instructions actually
3		would be on the submission, I would suggest, the
4		submission form to the SPA in respect of each item,
5		because it is not to say that you know so who was
6		there from Is somebody there from mark enhancement?
7		Yes, so Judith Archibald there from the mark enhancement
8		lab. So that is not to say that she would be
9		undertaking that examination, she is just there
10		representing that department from within the SPA so
11		I would suggest instruction would be on the
12		submission the forensic laboratory submission form
13		that would be submitted.
14	Q.	When you had this meeting on the 12th, did you discuss
15		whether or not fingerprint testing should be done on the
16		vest?
17	A.	We've obviously not done that, no. No. Because
18		sorry, just quickly glancing through the section is
19		there another section on fingerprints? No. So I would
20		suggest if it is not in the minute we haven't discussed
21		it.
22	Q.	I don't see anything. I am interested specifically
23		about fingerprinting of the vest.
24	Α.	Right.
25	Q.	So if that wasn't instructed, did you consider

1		instructing them not to do fingerprint testing given, as
2		we are aware, the use of this black powder can have
3		an impact on woven material and be to the detriment of
4		later tests?
5	Α.	I don't recall that, I don't recall that.
6	Q.	So your expectations in relation to item 4 there
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	what did you think the forensic lab was going to do
9		in relation to the footwear, and Nicole Short's vest?
10	A.	It would obviously be photographed prior to examination
11		so that is obviously reading that now my expectation
12		of that is that we are ensuring that we record what is
13		the mark on the vest before any forensic examination is
14		undertaken because, as you quite rightly said, it could
15		be I am going to use the word damaged but the mark
16		could be damaged by so you want it photographed
17		before that, and then for them to take to, you know,
18		carry out an examination.
19		What method they would do to do that, I don't know.
20		That is their expertise. And vice versa that is where
21		I would be relying on particularly Garry Sinclair and

I would be relying on particularly Garry Sinclair and John Ferguson, who are both very experienced scene managers, and the -- because they were liaising with the forensic lab. I wasn't myself -- I know you said the report was sent to me, but I wasn't liaising with the

1 forensic lab, I put in place that in principle it was 2 John Ferguson was liaising with the lab in relation to 3 all the examinations that were undertaken, and there was 4 quite a lot, you know, as you will be aware of, how many 5 examinations reports that you have. 6 Was it part of that discussion whether they would be Q. 7 doing DNA testing? On the boot? 8 Α. On the boots or the vest? 9 Q. 10 Α. On the vest, no I don't recall that. Would --Q. 11 12 Α. Sorry, can I just say as well, as I -- I would be 13 expecting if that is the area, if it's -- whoever, what area of expertise that is, I would be expecting them to 14 15 advise us what could be done. 16 And did they? Q. Because, you know, you can have a crossover between DNA 17 Α. 18 and fingerprints about who is best to do it, so it's not 19 just a case of like John chairing a meeting saying we 20 want this done, we want that done. It's: we have a mark 21 on this vest, how best can we proceed to identify if the 22 mark is relevant to the boots worn by the deceased? Q. And did the forensic scientists present give advice to 23 you about what tests could be done, what order they 24 should be done, what they could achieve with the vest 25

1		and the boots?
2	Α.	Around about the boots I can't I can't recall.
3		Sorry, I can't recall.
4	Q.	You don't remember. Did they give you any advice about
5		the potential impact of carrying out fingerprint testing
6		and the use of black powder and the impact that would
7		have on the vest?
8	Α.	I can't recall. Can I just ask was the vest
9		fingerprinted?
10	Q.	Yes, we have heard evidence that the vest was
11		fingerprinted.
12	Α.	Sorry, I can't recall.
13	Q.	And we have heard that as a result of that there was
14		black powder on the vest which had an impact
15	Α.	Right okay.
16	Q.	on the material. I am interested in what help for
17		you from the perspective of PIRC and the
18		investigation you were carrying out at that time, what
19		help would fingerprint testing have been in relation to
20		the vest?
21	Α.	It would be to try and identify who had been in contact
22		with that vest, you know. The challenge being that vest
23		was lying about the muster room or the room in if my
24		recollection is right it was lying about in the area
25		where the police officers were taken after the for

1 the PIP process. 2 How would that have helped your investigation, knowing Q. 3 who or -- that someone had touched the vest? 4 Α. I would suggest unless it was Mr Bayoh's prints that 5 were on it that any other officer could have carried the 6 vest at any time. Q. Where would that have taken the investigation? 7 8 I don't know if it would have taken it anywhere because Α. 9 they all work together, so moving somebody's body armour 10 about, you know, in a car, in an office, I don't see -at this time when I am sitting here I don't see any huge 11 12 relevance in it. 13 Q. We've not heard any evidence in the Inquiry that 14 Mr Bayoh put his hand on the vest or touched the vest or 15 anything of that sort. 16 Α. No. So perhaps not entirely relevant to the investigation? 17 Q. 18 Α. No. No. 19 Did you consider or discuss with the forensic scientists Q. 20 the possibility of testing soil? 21 Α. No, I didn't. No, I didn't. 22 Q. Or the substance --No, I didn't, I didn't. I am aware that -- I think the 23 Α. Inquiry got that done. No, I didn't. 24 Was that something you were aware of at the time that 25 Q.

1 was possible or --2 I was aware that soil sampling, you know, is available. Α. 3 But I don't -- and I don't remember it coming up. As 4 I say, this is not a case of John and I dictating: we 5 want this, we want that. We are looking for input from the experts to tell us this is what we can bring to the 6 7 table. I have to hold my hand up, bearing in mind this 8 was 2015, I left the police in 2009, although I did some 9 work for another policing agency, you know. But this 10 is -- you know, so science moves at a very fast right of 11 knots, so~... 12 Q. Did you feel you were reliant very much on the forensic 13 scientists keeping you up-to-date with what could be 14 done? 15 I felt -- yes, I felt I had a knowledge gap. I hold my Α. 16 hands up to that. This is why I have John Ferguson and 17 Garry Sinclair, that is -- you know, relying on them in 18 respect of that. 19 Looking back now, do you think there was maybe Q. 20 an opportunity for additional training, would that have 21 assisted you at that time? 22 Shortly after this, and -- it was on my training, we Α. went for a forensic awareness day up at the SPA. 23 I think that was in your paragraph 6 of your Inquiry 24 Q. 25 statement --

1	A.	Is it in my training aspects? Yes.
2	Q.	Do you remember at the beginning of your evidence on
3		Friday I think it was paragraph 6, it may have been 421.
4	A.	My recollection is that was arranged by Garry Sinclair.
5	Q.	Could we maybe just go to paragraph here it is. So
6		if we could see here we are:
7		"2017 to 2018.
8		" Forensic awareness day at SPA Gartcosh."
9		Could that have been it?
10	A.	Yes, that is it. Because Police Scotland run a crime
11		scene managers forum, and I am not saying it was me but
12		one of the Garry was like our lead scene manager so
13		one of Garry's objectives was to see if we could become
14		part of that forum, and so we were we would be
15		sitting and we would be hearing updates, we would be
16		aware of what new techniques would be available.
17	Q.	What was that forum called?
18	A.	I think it was the Crime Scene Managers Forum, and Garry
19		had interaction with the SPA in respect of trying to go
20		on it from their side and also I can't remember who
21		was the lead in Police Scotland at the time for scene
22		management.
23	Q.	Ultimately did PIRC get a seat at the table of the Crime
24		Scene Managers Forum?
25	Α.	I don't think we got a seat at the table. I think what

1		we got is we were included in any circulars that were
2		coming out of Gartcosh SPA in respect of forensic
3		developments.
4	Q.	Have you found that to be of assistance up until your
5		retirement?
6	A.	I couldn't say if I found it of assistance, but what
7		I am hoping for is somebody like Garry or John, you
8		know, they would be more forensically aware than what
9		they had previously been.
10	Q.	Thank you. I would like to move on and ask you some
11		questions about 3 June. This is the day prior to the
12		officers giving statements.
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	Can we look at paragraph 171 of the Inquiry statement we
15		have on the screen. So this is the day before and it is
16		mentioned you are asked about a generic interview
17		plan
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	that was completed by Investigating Officer Sinclair.
20		Is that Garry Sinclair?
21	A.	It is, yes.
22	Q.	Your response there is:
23		"Investigator Sinclair is a trained Interview
24		Advisor so I had approached him to create a generic
25		interview plan in preparation for when we could get to

1		interview the attending officers. This was unusual and
2		is not something that would regularly occur. I reviewed
3		the generic plan which was to be used."
4		Perhaps we could have a look at that generic
5		interview plan. PIRC 04182. If we look at the very top
6		of that page, do you recognise this as the witness
7		interview strategy?
8	Α.	Yes, the generic yes
9	Q.	Is that just another name for the generic interview
10		plan?
11	A.	Yes, that the witness interview strategy.
12	Q.	The names of the officers are on the front page, so it's
13		to cover the strategy for all of those officers?
14	Α.	It was to cover the nine officers, yes.
15	Q.	You have said Investigator Sinclair was a trained in
16		relation to preparing strategies; is that right?
17	Α.	He is a trained interview adviser, yes.
18	Q.	Can you explain to the Chair a little bit about that
19		role, what is involved with an interview a trained
20		officer?
21	Α.	First of all I am not a trained interview adviser. That
22		is a one of the kind of newer concepts that has come
23		through in the police but it is where you have what
24		could be a kind of lengthy interview covering
25		a wide-ranging area or a wide-ranging investigation and

1 it is to pull together in a structured manner 2 and covering areas that you wish covered. It is not 3 saying: ask this question ask that -- it is not 4 a question, question, question, it is areas to be 5 covered. It is also used -- maybe more used for suspect 6 interviews, or accused person interviews as we have now 7 in respect of that and they talk about the kind of 8 different phases in relation to that. So it is to 9 consider all the aspects and, yes, to prepare a kind of 10 areas to be covered. Q. You have told us that Garry Sinclair was trained and was 11 12 qualified to do this? 13 Yes, yes. Α. And you are not trained and qualified to do this role? 14 Q. 15 Α. No. I'm wondering if you felt at the time you knew what 16 Q. 17 Garry Sinclair's role was and how to get the best out of him in relation to this interview strategy? 18 19 I go back to the point I made a wee bit earlier is the Α. 20 PIRC staff are all multi-tasking, so we have got Garry 21 kind of leading the scene manager along with John, 22 I have got Garry leading in productions because all that stuff is going. You will see he is out taking 23 statements from people and then when we were advised 24 25 that the officers were going to make themselves

1 available, I asked Garry as -- I think at that time 2 Garry was our only trained interview adviser we had, so I asked Garry to prepare this interview. 3 4 I also remember that -- and I can't remember, I was 5 just having a wee flick through before that and the question before that is: 6 7 "On this day John Mitchell met with representatives of SPA and it was agreed that nine would provide 8 statements." 9 10 I was looking for the date for that. Because my 11 recollection is that Garry wasn't too happy with me 12 coming and doing that because I was giving him very 13 little notice to prepare this. On reflection there 14 should have been work ongoing almost from the start by 15 an interview adviser preparing, you know, because there would come a time we would get this. But we hadn't done 16 17 that. And that would be an oversight on my part because 18 I should have put that in place. 19 But again, as I said, we were kind of multitasking, 20 we were all over the place and I remember Garry 21 wasn't -- he was a bit like, "Gee, thanks", in respect 22 of that. So I did say to him I don't want one for each the individual officers, I want a generic to cover the 23 areas that we've been looking at and I was also --24 25 I put -- I gave him a timeline because I needed it in

1 time to pass out to the interview teams to give them 2 time to have a look at this, and then consider what they 3 needed to do in respect of the officers that they had 4 been asked to look at. So I would expect them to be 5 examining, you know like -- you know, different records 6 to see what part did they play in that, when were they 7 made aware of that because by the time we got that we 8 were into understanding what was in there, we were into 9 understanding what was in the CCTV. We were creating 10 these kind of timelines we have round about that. So, 11 yes --12 Q. How much time did Garry actually have in the end to 13 prepare this strategy? That is why I was looking to see when Mr Mitchell was 14 Α. 15 made aware that they were going to make themselves 16 available. My understanding is that it was on 2 June but we have 17 Q. not heard from Mr Mitchell --18 19 And the interviews on 4 June? Α. 20 Q. And the interviews took place on the 4 June. 21 Α. So he had a day. 22 That is the time Garry had? Q. Basically he had a day, yes, which is no ideal. Yes. 23 Α. Q. Do you know from your awareness of this role, is there 24 25 a recommended period of time for --

1	Α.	Sorry, I don't know, I don't have enough knowledge about
2		that.
3	Q.	I don't know if you were able to watch any of the
4		evidence I took from Mr Harrower?
5	Α.	I saw some of it, not all of it.
6	Q.	You saw some of it. Did you see any part of it where
7		I went through this interview strategy with him?
8	Α.	No.
9	Q.	Have a look at the interview strategy. You have
10		obviously said you recognise it and that is what
11		Garry Sinclair prepared. When I was asking
12		Mr Harrower
13	Α.	Sorry, do I have a copy of it?
14	Q.	If there is not a copy in your folder
15	Α.	No, sorry there is not a copy.
16	Q.	So page 1 names the officers and page 2 is a summary of
17		the events.
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	This summary indicates, if we can look at that, in the
20		middle of the page:
21		"It was reported that as the officers drove into
22		Hayfield Road they saw the male walking towards them, he
23		may have been in possession of a knife"
24		Then there is a comment:
25		"It may be that the knife was discarded before

1		this."
2		So Garry Sinclair is mentioning this
3	A.	So he taking cognisance of the additional information,
4		as I said, actually evidence coming in.
5	Q.	So may be he is taking cognisance of, for example, the
6		statement of Kevin Nelson?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	The officers exit their vehicles:
9		"It was reported that the male punched, then kicked
10		PC~ Nicole Short. Some officers drew their police
11		issue batons. Some also drew their PAVA and
12		CS sprays, which were subsequently sprayed towards the
13		male, however this had little effect."
14		So it appears there may or may not have been a knife
15		in Mr Bayoh's hands, the officers responded to that
16		using drawing their batons and some using sprays. So
17		again, comparing that to the briefing paper dated 3 May,
18		again there appears to be a suggestion that the
19		aggressor, if I can call it that, the subject, was
20		approaching the officers, perhaps with a knife or
21		perhaps without. But they responded to that using
22		batons and sprays?
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	Then if we can carry on moving through the document, you
25		will see that the next page should say, "Purpose of

1		interview". And it talks about carrying out:
2		" a planned and structured interview of the
3		police witness to achieve a detailed account of their
4		movements, intentions and actions~"
5		Do you see that?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	The intentions is part of it.
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	Does that relate back to seeking we have heard that
10		officers have to justify every use of force, every
11		individual use of force?
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	Thank you. Then moving on, "Background of officer",
14		some details of who they are?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	Introduction and this sets out sorry, "Description
17		of officer", some preliminary personal details. Moving
18		on, "Introduction", asking some asking officers in
19		their own words to say what sort of happened at first,
20		what happened first.
21		Keep going. Asking about a muster. Asking about
22		incident attendance, where they were when they heard the
23		call, how they became aware of it and how they travelled
24		to the incident. Do you see all of that?
25	Α.	Yes, I do.

1	Q.	Please ask me to stop if you
2	Α.	No, it's okay.
3	Q.	If you need more time. Then, "Arrival at locus":
4		"Describe what you saw when you arrived at the
5		locus."
6		What Mr Bayoh was doing, wearing, was he in
7		possession of anything. There is a map referred to.
8	Α.	Yes, I remember that, yes.
9	Q.	"Initial dealings with deceased":
10		"Did you get out of the vehicle?
11		"What did you do?"
12		And these questions are focused on what the officer
13		did, what the officer said, and what the officer heard.
14		There's nothing here in this section about dealings with
15		the deceased that relates to intentions or the mindset
16		of the officers or that seeks justification for their
17		actions. Now, would you not have expected to see some
18		sort of questioning about that in the interview
19		strategy?
20	Α.	Well, it says at the start you know, there is the
21		phrase, "The intentions", I agree with you it is not
22		included in that area, but I would expect the
23		investigators who were obtaining statements off the
24		officers what you know, you know, to clarify if
25		something, you know, you know, did anyone else get out

1 the vehicle? Well, why did they do that? Did you approach Mr Bayoh? Why did you approach him in that 2 3 manner? Did you approach -- why did you approach in 4 that manner? This is -- as I say this is this was 5 generic and I would expect investigators not just to ask this but to flesh out round about that. 6 7 Q. There is no questions about why did you use force at 8 that point? Why did you use your baton? Why did you 9 use your spray? Why did you not use a less forceful 10 method/tactical option? Did you consider and preclude other less forceful tactical options? Those could also 11 12 be generic questions asked of all officers but they 13 haven't been asked at all. 14 Okay. Α. 15 Do you think on reflection those questions should have Q. been included in a witness strategy? 16 If they are not included in the witness strategy I would 17 Α. 18 expect it to be fleshed out in the statement. 19 Why would you expect the witness strategy to ask the Q. 20 question or prompt the officers: did you get out of the 21 police vehicle? But not include a question that asks for a justification for use of force? Do you think on 22 reflection it would have been wise to have questions 23 about justification for use of force? 24 25 Α. Yes, because of where we are now sitting, yes.

1	Q.	Then other questions relate to post-arrest and medical
2		care, post-incident procedures and other ancillary
3		details.
4	A.	Sorry, can we go back up to if you don't mind.
5	Q.	Not at all.
6	A.	Just go up to the section around about So the
7		question around about arrest and restraint, so there
8		nothing in there about so there is:
9		"Did you use your PAVA or CS spray, baton,
10		handcuffs~ during the incident?"
11	Q.	Yes, but it doesn't ask why.
12	A.	Yes, but that was like, you know you know, this is
13		very generic, prepared in a hurry. But I would expect
14		then that would be like: well, why did you do that?
15		Because, I think as I said on Friday, the officers used
16		everything in their tool box, for want of a better
17		expression, that they had that day. So I would fully
18		expect: well, why did you use your CS spray?
19	Q.	So your expectation would be that perhaps as
20		a supplementary to that question:
21		"Did you use your PAVA or CS spray, baton, handcuffs
22		or leg restraints during the incident? If yes, when?"
23		No question, "If yes why?" But you would have
24		expected officers to have asked why?
25	A.	Yes.

1	Q.	Would your expectation be that all investigators taking
2		statements that day would have known that they should be
3		asking questions why about justification
4	Α.	Yes, because it is you know, it's partly the role
5		that we undertake is you know is it proportionate,
6		necessary, justified.
7	Q.	All right. Thank you. There's something else missing
8		from the strategy, and that is questions about race?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	Sitting here now looking back at the witness strategy,
11		if you were keeping an open mind about race, is there
12		any reason why there wouldn't be specific questions
13		directed towards motivation, bias, racial
14		discrimination?
15	Α.	As you say, that is sitting here now. A primary focus
16		of the Public Inquiry is the race and how much did race
17		play a part in this. Although, and I think I answered
18		in my Rule 8 I have said that, you know, we were trying
19		to be mindful of race but we had never received
20		an instruction to investigate race until about a month
21		after that. The matter of race had never been raised
22		with myself or Alistair or John, although I wasn't at
23		one of the meetings with Alistair but I know the
24		meetings I was at by the family that race played a part
25		in this.

1 Q. Would you --

2	Α.	And actually, the first that race was mentioned when
3		I say by the family I am going to include Mr Anwar in
4		the aspect of the family was at a meeting we had when
5		the family and Mr Anwar came and met with the former
6		Commissioner, and the phrase used at that time was, "Can
7		we talk about the elephant in the room?"
8	Q.	Was that in early September.
9	Α.	That was in early September, although we had received
10		an instruction from Crown in July in respect of race.
11		John and I were trying everybody was trying to keep
12		an open mind about race. But when I briefed Garry about
13		this, is I I don't recall saying to him, "You need to
14		put matters of race in here", Garry is looking at what
15		we have been instructed to undertake, instructions we
16		received at that time, and he is mindful of what
17		evidence we have coming in and he has sat and prepared
18		that, and if Garry was sitting here now he would
19		absolutely say, "I didn't have enough time to prepare
20		that properly", I am quite certain he would.
21		But we are sitting in hindsight here but the reality
22		of it, if Mr Mitchell was made aware on 22nd sorry,
23		on the 2nd and we were interviewing the officers on the

4th and we had to get all that organised and I had said

I need a generic witness strategy to assist the

25

1		interview teams.
2	Q.	You have given me a lot there.
3	A.	Sorry.
4	Q.	No, not at all. We have heard evidence that obviously
5		this Mr Bayoh died.
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	He was in contact or in custody of the police, and he
8		died after that, and he was black.
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And we have heard police officers indicate that those
11		factors made it likely there would be high interest
12		publicly, a lot of media attention. And that the issue
13		of race given bearing in mind some officers said they
14		were aware of events in England, down with the Met, in
15		America, that race would be a big factor. So we have
16		heard evidence from officers about that.
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	Are you suggesting that it was PIRC's expectation that
19		unless the family raised race, you wouldn't be dealing
20		with it at all?
21	Α.	No, I am not saying we we would be mindful of it, we
22		would be mindful. But I go back to the kind of
23		legislation in respect of PIRC is Crown instruct us what
24		to investigate. We never received an you know, to
25		investigate the matter of race until July.

1 Q. I will come back to that, because you -- there may be an issue about when you were instructed by the Crown and 2 we will come back to that. We will look at the letters 3 4 after the break. But am I right in thinking that your 5 authority and your power and PIRC's authority comes from a Crown Office instruction? 6 7 Α. Yes. Unless it is something to do with the Chief Constable, 8 Q. 9 but in this case we were looking at Crown Office? 10 Α. Yes, it's a Crown instruction. But is it will be possible for PIRC to contact Crown and 11 Q. 12 say, "We would like to you instruct us to look at this", 13 so that you have the authority from the Crown but you 14 could instigate that instruction or encourage that 15 instruction? Well, we could. I was -- I would say my involvement 16 Α. with Crown was at a fairly low level, for want of 17 18 a better expression. There was discussions ongoing. The circumstances you give, I would say that is maybe 19 20 more pertinent where there has not been the same 21 interaction between PIRC and Crown and there has maybe 22 been -- you know, as we go along we identify something 23 and we realise that requires or should form part of a different instruction, maybe we would go to Crown and 24 25 say, "Would you consider that that should be instructed

1 to us?" And that ... But in this instance we have, you know -- as I said, I did a seven-day paper I think and 2 3 I then did a three or four-week paper to Crown 4 highlighting where we are, what we are looking at, what 5 are the issues. At no time did anybody come and say to me, "I am instructing you to investigate race", at that 6 7 time. 8 We were trying to be mindful of race, and I am aware just from the points you have laid out that race was 9 10 playing a part here, particularly around about the media attention, and you know -- but, yes. So there are 11 12 a number of factors here. Why is race not in there? 13 I don't recall specifically briefing Garry to include race because I am certain if I had he would have 14 15 included it there. 16 But as far as you are concerned at that time when you Q. were taking statements from the officers, there is no 17 instructions from Crown --18 19 No, as far as I am aware there are no instructions --Α. 20 That is my understanding. Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 No instructions from the Crown to investigate race. So Q. it wasn't a specific part of your terms of reference? 23 24 Α. No. So although you are saying PIRC were being mindful of 25 Q.

1 it, would that in a sense restrict your ability to pursue an active line of investigation in relation to 2 3 race? Yes. Yes. Sitting here now, yes, I would ... yes, 4 Α. 5 I would say so, yes. Bearing in mind my recollection is we got a further instruction from Crown -- was it on the 6 7 2nd or the 5th June? And I remember the wording of the 8 instruction was, "Concerns have been raised by the Bayoh 9 family in relation to the following matters". 10 Q. I will come on to --But none of them say race in that instruction. 11 Α. 12 MS GRAHAME: I will come on to the instructions. I am conscious of the time. 13 14 LORD BRACADALE: We will take a 15-minute break at this 15 point. (3.01 pm) 16 17 (A short break) 18 (3.22 pm) 19 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 20 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I would like to ask you about when 21 you became aware that the family had concerns about race 22 as perhaps being a factor in the death of Mr Bayoh. Before the break I said there are some issues about when 23 24 you were actually instructed by Crown. If we can begin 25 with some preliminary issues. We have heard evidence in

1		the Inquiry that on 3 May, when the family were speaking
2		to Mitchell and Parker who were the officers who
3		delivered the death message
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	that there had been discussion about race at that
6		meeting, that the family had raised concerns about race
7		and in particular had made reference to recent events at
8		that time in Baltimore in America, involving I think the
9		death of a black man. Was that something that you were
10		ever made aware of when you came in on 4 May?
11	A.	No, I have no recollection of that whatsoever.
12	Q.	Had anyone discussed with you at that stage, or at any
13		stage, that the family had raised this issue on 3 May?
14	A.	No. No, that was not part of the briefing
15		that I received. I don't know what is on in their
16		statements either, those officers' statements, is it
17		raised there? I don't
18	Q.	I am interested in your awareness
19	A.	Yes, I understand that.
20	Q.	as lead investigator; was that ever drawn to your
21		attention?
22	A.	No, no.
23	Q.	Had it been drawn to your attention what would you
24		have you have said you were mindful of race, what
25		would you have done in relation to that information?

1 Α. What would I have done in respect of that is (a) would 2 have raised it with my senior management because there 3 you have the family of a victim who -- who are 4 perceiving that race played a part in this incident. So 5 that would need exploring because one of the things that would happen would be -- is during the course of the 6 7 family being spoken to is -- is to establish with the 8 family as to why they perceive that as, you know, race 9 being -- played a part in this incident.

10 So there would have been a course of action in 11 respect of that, and I would have expected my senior 12 managers to raise that with Crown in respect of the 13 referral, bearing in mind we got an additional referral 14 on the 5th. Not -- well we got referral on the 5th but 15 then the terms of that referral change from the verbal 16 instruction.

Q. So if that had been brought to your attention, that is
something you would have raised with both your line
managers or the management of PIRC --

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. -- and the Crown?

A. Yes. Well, I would have expected the managers to haveraised that.

Q. Which manager do you think you would have raised itwith, or would it have been more than one?

1 Α. If I had been made aware of that on the 4th, and I think 2 I am slightly at odds with yourself, because my 3 recollection is John Mitchell was in on the 4th but 4 I think, you know --5 We have not heard from him. Q. But definitely Irene Scullion would have been there, so 6 Α. that would have been -- because, you know, that is the 7 8 family identifying that they perceive race as an issue, so we would be required to take that forward. 9 10 Q. And required to take it forward, that would be to Crown, would it? 11 12 Α. Well, yes. In the first instance go to Crown in respect 13 of that, but my understanding of -- if -- if a victim or 14 any person, you know, identifies race as being an issue 15 within -- or a factor within an incident, then, you know, we have to accept that, we have to take that 16 17 forward. And my understanding is we need to notify 18 Crown about that is my understanding of that, and also 19 my understanding is that we need to establish why they 20 perceive that, and that was not a line of enquiry that 21 was pursued by the PIRC, it was not pursued by the FLOs, 22 I didn't instruct them or ask them to pursue that. 23 Right. But if you had been made aware that the family Q. had raised this on the 3rd, is that something you could 24 have pursued? 25

1	A.	Yes, absolutely.
2	Q.	Liaising of course with Crown?
3	A.	Yes, yes.
4	Q.	And getting an instruction from the Crown?
5	A.	I would have expected an instruction from them in that
6		regard, yes.
7	Q.	The other thing I want to ask you about is a meeting
8		that took place involving the Commissioner, Kate Frame
9		herself, and the Lord Advocate was present. It was
10		a meeting involving PIRC and Crown Office. You weren't
11		at this meeting.
12	A.	No, I was not, no.
13	Q.	I understand we have not heard evidence yet from
14		Ms Frame in this regard, so I understand it took place
15		on 14 May.
16	A.	Okay.
17	Q.	And that during that meeting the question of race was
18		raised, and there was a note in the minutes saying:
19		"This element should be looked at by PIRC."
20		That is my understanding of the position.
21	A.	Okay.
22	Q.	Kate Frame, I am advised was present, she is certainly
23		minuted as being present
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	along with the Lord Advocate, John Mitchell,

1		Les Brown from Crown Office?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	And it was a meeting with the PIRC on 14 May.
4	A.	Okay.
5	Q.	If you take that from me that that is correct, and
6		Kate Frame was present.
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	I appreciate by 14 May you were working as deputy to
9		John McSporran.
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	Were you aware from that matter being raised with
12		Kate Frame and that the PIRC should be looking into
13		questions of race, that she raised that with you or
14		John McSporran or anybody who was involved in the
15		investigation?
16	A.	No, I have no recollection of that. Of that. I have to
17		say if that was communicated to myself then I would have
18		undertaken action like you said apart from the
19		communicating with Crown. But I would have put in place
20		no matter about, you know, the perception from the
21		family as to why they considered race because I think it
22		would be important to understand why they considered
23		race to be a factor. But that was never communicated to
24		myself, and well, John McSporran will be able to
25		answer that. But if John had done that we would have

1		raised an action round about that, that is you know
2		that would be in the FLO log sorry, not that
3		would I can't see how that would not be in John's
4		decision log and I don't think that is in John's
5		decision log.
6	Q.	You are talking about John McSporran?
7	A.	Yes, John's policy log, yes.
8	Q.	Let me just look at the decision log. This is
9		PIRC 04153. And we can have that on the screen but from
10		my looking at it there is nothing referred to on 14 May
11		that would indicate anything in relation to race had
12		been raised with him. There is an entry on the 13th,
13		a number of entries on the 13th and an entry on the
14		14th sorry, 15 May, so no entry on the 14th at all.
15		And then decision 33 is 15 May, the following day:
16		"Obtain precise details of all Police Scotland
17		communication with family of deceased."
18		This relates to the various different accounts
19		regarding the death.
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	"Establish who provided information to the family, what
22		that information was, who authorised it, where it is
23		recorded."
24		And:
25		"It may assist the Inquiry to establish what

1		occurred at the point of arrest."
2		And then the next entry goes on to the 17 May.
3	A.	Okay, I was I was just flicking here, sorry
4		Ms Grahame, to see if there was anything in my daybook
5		in respect of that. (Pause).
6	Q.	I think the daybook that you have hard copy of goes up
7		to 13 May, so it's the day prior, unless you have the
8		one from 14 May that you are looking at.
9	Α.	No, I I don't think so.
10	Q.	We can maybe
11	Α.	13 May
12	Q.	look that out.
13	Α.	Sorry was the meeting did you sorry I've lost
14		it
15	Q.	14 May. So it was the day after the daybook we have
16		been looking at in detail. I think you have got the
17		copy of.
18	A.	No
19	Q.	But your notebook covers that period.
20	A.	Right. Over and above that, if that was the case
21		I would still expect a written instruction to come from
22		Crown in respect of that.
23	Q.	Right.
24	A.	I yes.
25	Q.	I think just for completeness in your notebook on page 6

1		you can see an entry from 12 May and then if you go on
2		to page 7 you will see at the very top it's 13 May and
3		then there is an entry for Thursday 14 May, it appears
4		to say, "Reported on duty"?
5	Α.	Yes, basically it is just that I'm on duty and I'm off
6		duty.
7	Q.	And then, "Off duty". There is no entry in that.
8	Α.	So that would be there was nothing evidentially
9		significant like an additional instruction or I was
10		involved in any evidence gathering, taking possession or
11		something, taking a statement off somebody. So I
12		I have never been aware made aware of that. I don't
13		know you know, I don't know if we have the minutes,
14		do we have the minutes? Did Ms Frame get the minutes of
15		that meeting, I don't know.
16	Q.	We will hear from Ms Frame in due course but as far as
17		you are concerned you didn't know anything about that?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	There are no entries in your notebook and we will
20		provide you with a hard copy of the daybook for the
21		following period, for 14 May.
22	A.	Something has caught my eye here, I don't want to put
23		you off your train of thought, but it's something we
24		were discussing earlier when we were discussing in
25		relation to the fingerprint examination of the vest.

1		I have a note here in my daybook from the 13th and it is
2		basically like actions and I have got:
3		"Garry/Billy~"
4	Q.	Is that page 7, 13 May?
5	Α.	I have "Garry/Billy", and I have underlined it. So
6		that's Garry Sinclair and Billy Davidson, who was with
7		us at that time. I've got:
8		"Prepare forms for gateway.
9		"Production 8, personal radio plus blood splatter or
10		contact.
11		"Production 51, vest of Nicole Short.
12		"Production 166, R boot.
13		"Production 167, left boot for photos and
14		examination of thread."
15		So I have not asked for fingerprint examination
16		because we then go on to another list where I have put:
17		"Photos.
18		"DNA.
19		"F/fingerprints."
20		So my instruction has not been for fingerprint
21		examination.
22	Q.	Thank you.
23	Α.	Now, whether that got mixed up in the but
24	Q.	All right.
25	Α.	Sorry, that just caught my eye there.

1	Q.	No, that is very helpful. Thank you. So we were
2		talking about 14 May. You've no recollection of that
3		being raised with you by Kate Frame or any other
4		manager?
5	Α.	No.
6	Q.	Can we look at your Inquiry statement, please,
7		paragraph 202, and I think before the break you
8		mentioned early July or 2 July.
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	So paragraph 202 of 421. You see here you were asked:
11		"On 2 July the PIRC was further directed by
12		[Crown Office] to investigate the allegations~ $\dots$ "
13		I won't read the whole thing out, and then I think
14		you say:
15		"My understanding is that this email of
16		2 July 2015"
17		Now, this was an email from the Crown Office to
18		PIRC; is that right?
19	A.	Yes, I think it is an email.
20	Q.	Yes:
21		" was a further instruction from [Crown Office]
22		to investigate each of the four points~"
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	An allegation of criminal conduct made by Zahid Saeed?
25	A.	Yes.

"Investigate issues of race and conduct. 1 Q. 2 "Investigate allegations of potential contraventions 3 of the Data Protection Act 1988." 4 And investigate miscellaneous other matters. 5 Can I ask you to look at this email. The one on 2 July, as I understand it, is the fourth instruction that PIRC 6 received from Crown Office. And it is COPFS 04808. You 7 8 will see at the top it says it's from Les Brown --Yes. 9 Α. 10 Q. -- who is in Crown Office, and it is sent to 11 Stephen McGowan, PF major crime and fatalities 12 investigation. Subject Sheku Bayoh. And then just 13 beneath that you see from Les Brown 2 July, 16.11 to 14 John McSporran and it relates to Sheku Bayoh, and if we 15 can have a look -- so is this the email that you -- do you recognise this as the email that you are referring 16 17 to? 18 A. I knew we received a further instruction, you know. 19 Yes, I knew -- yes. Q. Let's go through this: 20 "Dear John ..." 21 It's to John McSporran: 22 "Thank you for forwarding the email ... from 23 24 Aamer Anwar. 25 "Standing that the majority of points raised by

1 Mr Anwar were raised at a meeting between the family of Mr Bayoh and PIRC investigators, the Crown consider that 2 3 the extent of information disclosed by PIRC at this 4 stage is an operational one to be taken by the Commissioner. That decision will no doubt be 5 informed by the processes that have been applied by PIRC 6 7 in relation to previous investigations, and by the 8 practices followed by the Police in updating the family 9 prior to a report being submitted to the 10 Procurator Fiscal. "As you are aware Mr Anwar has raised four issues 11 12 directly with the Crown: 13 "(i) In relation to the request to view CCTV footage 14 I am content that this is an operational decision for 15 PIRC that can be responded to in accordance with your usual practice." 16 So that relates to the CCTV? 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 "(ii) The information provided in relation to the case Q. 20 against Nicole Short is relatively vague and there is no 21 indication as to the source of the information. As such you will no doubt wish to clarify matters before 22 deciding how to proceed. The position of the Crown is 23 that the case against this officer is live and 24 proceeding." 25

That relates to Nicole Short: 1 2 "(iii) In respect of the allegation concerning 3 Mr Saeed, as this appears to include an allegation of 4 criminal conduct this should form part of the investigations by PIRC." 5 So that relates to criminal conduct alleged 6 concerning Mr Zahid Saeed. And then: 7 "(iv) I can confirm that the Crown will take 8 9 responsibility for the instruction of appropriate 10 experts in relation to positional asphyxiation. We will however take account of any proposals that you make in 11 12 this regard. I will advise Mr Anwar that I have 13 responded directly to you. "Regards." 14 15 So there are four items there, but they relate to CCTV, Nicole Short, Zahid Saeed and positional asphyxia. 16 17 Let's go back to your Inquiry statement. You will start to see why I was asking -- this was paragraph 202 and 18 you will start to see why I was going to ask you 19 20 a little bit more about the letters of instruction and 21 what you received when. So 202 --Sorry, Ms Grahame, can I just check something if you 22 Α. don't mind. 23 Q. Yes, please do because this is confusing me and I am 24 25 hoping you can help me understand it.

1	A.	Sorry, I am a bit confused here as well and not wanting
2		to I have it in the back of my head that I was on
3		holiday over 2 July.
4	Q.	Right.
5	Α.	So I am just trying to see
6		(Pause).
7		You see, it's redacted out here but I have myself
8		I've got myself here on now, we don't have my
9		daybook, that only runs up to 14 May I think you said,
10		or 13 May.
11	Q.	Yes.
12	A.	But looking at my notebook and yes, sometimes there
13		will be a date gap in my notebook but not in this period
14		because of dealing with this investigation, so I have
15	Q.	Can we just take a moment and get this up on screen.
16		I think it will be between pages 12 and 13 of your
17		notebook, which is PIRC 04200. I think page 13 does
18		have a redaction on it but you will see an entry
19		Monday it's either 11 July
20	A.	It's 13 July.
21	Q.	or 13 July?
22	A.	It's 13 July. So you've got an entry on Friday,
23		26 June
24	Q.	That is at the bottom of page 12?
25	A.	Then you have an entry at Monday 13 July.

1	Q.	So the bottom of page 12 is from June and then if we
2		look at the top of page 13 we will see the entry that
3		says Monday, 13 July.
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	I am interested in
6	A.	The 2nd.
7	Q.	2 July. From your own recollection of your notebook
8		are you suggesting that that redacted version relates to
9		2 July? We can have that checked.
10	A.	I think I am on holiday that period.
11	Q.	Oh, right. So you weren't present on 2 July? Maybe?
12	A.	Sitting here now I don't think so but on We
13		received the additional instruction, the additional
14		instruction is as I have listed it, and that is how we
15		have recorded it into our final reports. But I believe
16		that that redaction is I am on holiday.
17	Q.	All right. Thank you. We can double-check that
18		overnight.
19	A.	Please. I know it's still fair to say but my
20		understanding of the kind of $\ldots$ when I have answered
21		this question, I don't know if that email was made
22		available to me.
23	LOR	D BRACADALE: I think, Mr Little, if we let Ms Grahame
24		work through this process, I think we will get
25		an answer.

1	MS	GRAHAME: We will come back to that tomorrow, Mr Little.
2		If we looked at as I showed you the email on 2 July.
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	We read that out. We have looked at it. Let's go back
5		to your Inquiry statement, paragraph 202.
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	It may be that your Inquiry statement is not correct and
8		if so I would just like you to help us with that. 202,
9		2 July 2015. There we are. This is where you say this
10		is the point at which the Crown instruct by email on
11		2 July and you include there:
12		"Investigate issues of race and conduct."
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	Now, I can't see any reference to that in the email of
15		2 July so do you think your statement could be mistaken,
16		particularly if you were on holiday on that date, about
17		the contents of the letter of instruction from the
18		Crown?
19	A.	Yes.
20	Q.	Because that doesn't appear in that email.
21	Α.	Yes, so my apologies, I think I have read when
22		I have read the question that you have asked of me
23		there, and my recollection, and I will base that
24		recollection on what is on the PIRC report.
25	Q.	I think this is also in the PIRC report.

1	A.	Yes. Because we my understanding is we got
2		an instruction, and this was the areas that we were
3		asked to look at.
4	Q.	But looking at the email now
5	A.	Yes.
6	Q.	looking at your statement, and if you can take from
7		me that this also appears in the PIRC report, do you
8		think now, looking at it in light of the email, that
9		perhaps that is a mistake?
10	A.	I do, yes. Yes. And when you showed me the email
11		I don't recall reading that email in the last few
12		months, which you know, obviously information was
13		made available for my Rule 8.
14	Q.	Thank you. So did you rely on the PIRC report when
15		you
16	A.	For
17	Q.	completed your statement?
18	A.	Amongst a number of other areas, yes: my notebook and
19		the book, yes. And my previous statements. Yes.
20	Q.	But if you were on holiday there wouldn't be any
21		information in your notebook?
22	A.	No, but I would be made aware when I came back that
23		there was yes, because I mean you will maybe come
24		on to it but the matter regarding the criminal conduct
25		allegation made by Mr Zahid Saeed, I undertook that part

of the investigation. 1 Thank you. Can we look at PIRC 04153 which is the 2 Q. 3 policy log that Mr McSporran created, and look at decision 57. This was created on 3 July, so the date 4 after the email Crown Office instruction and it refers 5 specifically to the instruction from Crown Office, the 6 7 Crown Office instruction, and it says: 8 "Item 3 is an instruction to investigate 9 Zahid Saeed's allegation (made by Mr Anwar) of criminal 10 conduct by police officers when dealing with them. "- Raise actions and investigate -11 12 "Interview officers. Interview Saeed - he has never 13 previously made these allegations and obtain his statement as to why he says this happened." 14 15 Does that seem to suggest the letter of instruction or the email of instruction from Crown at that point 16 17 related to Zahid Saeed's allegations? Yes, absolutely, yes. 18 Α. 19 Q. And that is consistent with the email I have shown you 20 from the 2nd? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. I have just received a message that we can confirm the redaction confirms you were on annual leave between 23 24 29 June and 12 July. A. Thank you. 25

1 Q. Thank you very much. Let me move on then because I would like to move on to the next letter of 2 3 instruction that I have and this is from -- well, it 4 relates to a letter from the Crown on 24 August, 2015. So can I ask you to look at COPFS 02768A. You will see 5 that on the screen. On the screen is a letter from the 6 7 Crown Office, "Criminal allegations against police 8 division", to Kate Frame, the Commissioner, and it is 9 dated 24 August 2015. And you will see that it -- if we 10 can look at the page: "In terms of section 33A of the~... Act 2006, 11 12 I write to ask you to carry out an investigation in relation to the circumstances in relation to attached 13 14 correspondence from Aamer Anwar. 15 "I have today written to the Deputy Chief Constable~... to advise him that I have instructed 16 17 you to take forward the investigation into this case and I have asked him to facilitate a handover of the 18 investigation to you." 19 20 So it's a letter from Les Brown, Head of Criminal 21 Allegations Against Police Division, to the Commissioner, dated 24 August. 22 23 A. Yes. Q. Do you recognise that letter as a further letter of 24 25 instruction from the Crown?

1	Α.	Yes, it's a yes, sorry.
2	Q.	And then if we look as we scroll down you will see
3		the attachment to this letter.
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	This is a letter on Mr Anwar's headed notepaper.
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	It's dated 31 July 2015. So it's his letter of 31 July
8		sent to PIRC by the Crown on 24 August.
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	It is a copy of a letter that was originally said to be
11		sent to Mr Stephen House, the then Chief Constable of
12		Police Scotland.
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	And it relates to the death of Sheku Bayoh in police
15		custody, and as we scroll through you will see that it
16		spills on to a fourth page. So that is page 2 we see.
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	And then keep going, you will see the last page is just
19		at the top of page 4. This is a letter that was sent by
20		Mr Anwar to the Chief Constable.
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	It appears the Crown have put a covering letter on it
23		and attached it and sent it to PIRC?
24	A.	Yes, I remember that.
25	Q.	If we can go back to page 3 of the July letter sorry,

1 let's start at page 2 actually. Item 6. At the bottom there's reference to matters involving data protection 2 3 which I will come on to at a later stage. A list of 4 names are given, starting at the bottom of that page, 5 and moving on to the top of page 3. 6 Mm-hmm. Α. 7 Q. And then at paragraph 7 there is a request for an audit 8 to be carried out for Alan Paton, who we have heard is 9 one of the officers who attended Hayfield Road: 10 "... and other officers for access to personal data as the Bayoh family are seriously concerned with regards 11 12 to the serious allegations made to them." So there is mention of that there. 13 Yes. 14 Α. 15 I would like you to look at another letter that is the Q. same date. So this is a letter that is attached to the 16 Crown Office instruction. 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. Could you also look for me please at COPFS 04726A. This 20 letter is also written by Aamer Anwar on headed paper, 21 it is also dated 31 July but this letter is sent to the Commissioner for the attention of John McSporran and 22 Kate Frame. Do you see that? 23 I do, yes. 24 Α. If we look at the last page of this letter, do we see it 25 Q.

1		is actually 11 pages? So it is substantially longer?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	The copied letter that the Crown copied to PIRC spilled
4		on to a fourth page but, as you will see, the end of
5		this letter is 11 pages. We will see that. If we go to
6		the very bottom of the page you will see it has "11" at
7		the bottom?
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	Towards the final part of that letter do we see it
10		wasn't just sent to the Commissioner for the attention
11		of McSporran and Frame, but it was also cc'd to the then
12		Lord Advocate, Commissioner, Les Brown at Crown Office,
13		Lindsay Miller, who is a Fiscal with at that time
14		Organised Crime and Counter Terrorism?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	There is quite a difference in length between these two
17		letters and I don't plan to go through every single
18		paragraph with you, but would it appear on the face of
19		it that Mr Anwar has sent an 11-page letter to PIRC?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	Copied to Lord Advocate, a four-page letter to the
22		Chief Constable?
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	But the letter which has been forwarded to PIRC by the
25		Crown and which the instructions are based on is the

1		Chief Constable four-page letter?
2	Α.	On the face of it, yes. Yes.
3	Q.	Not letter that was sent to PIRC
4	Α.	No.
5	Q.	direct. I would like to look at some of the
6		differences between these letters and see what impact,
7		if any, it made on what PIRC were doing in the
8		investigation. So let's look again for a moment at the
9		Crown Office letter of instruction, 24 August,
10		COPFS 02768A. If you could take it from me this is the
11		Chief Constable letter that is attached to this.
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	There is no reference to race in the Chief Constable
14		letter. If you can take that from me for the moment.
15	Α.	Okay. Without reading it, yes, okay.
16	Q.	So in terms of the instruction received from the Crown,
17		there is no instruction on page 1, the covering letter
18		from the Crown about race, and there is no reference to
19		race in the Chief Constable's letter that is copied and
20		attached.
21	Α.	Okay.
22	Q.	In terms of instructions from Crown, what impact did
23		that letter have on your investigation?
24	A.	Well, Crown is formally instructing us to undertake
25		investigation into the points that are raised by

1 Mr Anwar.

2	Q.	Right. So in the absence of a formal instruction in
3		relation to race attached to that letter, what authority
4		did PIRC have to investigate race at that time?
5	Α.	They hadn't received a formal instruction, if that is
6		I have obviously got mixed up with the email, but that
7		is yes, we've not received a formal instruction but
8		we have undertaken the matter into race.
9	Q.	However, in the other letter that Mr Anwar sent to PIRC
10		direct, so this is COPFS 04726A. This is the 11 page
11		letter. Can we look at page 2, please, paragraph 11:
12		"It also has been alleged that"
13		This is the letter from Mr Anwar:
14		" this officer has a history of racism from
15		a young age. Can you advise whether that has been
16		checked and considered? For instance, have family
17		members such as his mother, father and sister been
18		interviewed in the same way as Mr Bayoh's family were,
19		to assist the investigation?"
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	If we could also look at paragraph 23, on page 4:
22		"Can you advise whether PIRC has identified the
23		primary contentious features in this case, including
24		restraint and race? This would not be to prejudgment
25		investigation or with the purpose of ruling those issues

1 in or out, but to make clear the PIRC is aware of and has identified the primary concerns and issues that need 2 3 to be examined and to put on public record that the PIRC 4 recognises the important questions and issues to explore 5 and is there to conduct a robust investigation will go some way to satisfying the family as well as public 6 7 interest and concern about his death." 8 And 24, if we can move up: "Has PIRC investigated if any of the nine officers 9 10 involved were involved in the race case investigated by Fife Police division between 2014 and 2015 regarding 11 12 text messages?" 13 Paragraph 26: 14 "As you will be aware that we are receiving 15 assistance from Inquest, a charity that deals with deaths in custody. Many of the cases they have worked 16 17 on have presented disturbing images of violence and racism, ascribing to black people stereotypical 18 characteristics of extraordinary strength, dangerousness 19 20 and criminality thus attempting to blame the victim for 21 their own death, either by their pathological condition or their personal choice." 22 Then moving on to page 5, the second paragraph --23 the first paragraph talks about violence and risks. The 24 25 second paragraph says:

1 "In the context of black deaths in custody the issue of race/racism has not been referred to by the PIRC or 2 3 included in the terms of reference. Why not?" 4 Next paragraph: "You will be aware that evidence of racial 5 stereotyping by the Met led to a most damages censure of 6 7 the police when a public inquiry attributed the bungled 8 police investigation into the racist murder of 9 Stephen Lawrence to institutionalised racism." 10 And then the next paragraph: "The Bayoh family is concerned that racial 11 12 stereotyping may have been a contributory factor in the 13 death of Sheku Bayoh, resulting from restraint/use of 14 force. The question of racism has from the very 15 beginning been the elephant in the room. Can you advise how this forms part of the investigation process?" 16 17 Then in paragraph 27 there is mention of "violent" and "aggressive" and the use of language, and value lead 18 in terms. So you can see in relation to this much 19 20 longer letter there are a number of references --21 Α. Yes, absolutely, absolutely. -- to race. Do you remember PIRC receiving that letter? 22 Q. Have you ever seen that letter? 23 I remember in the context there was a letter received 24 Α. 25 from Mr Anwar that had 50-odd points or whatever, and

1 I believe that was answered by the Commissioner. This is 53 paragraphs about points that are raised. 2 Q. Yes. I remember when we received the instruction from 3 Α. 4 Crown and, as you said, it was front sheeted, I was 5 a bit concerned, so: is this how Crown instruct us now? Just put a front sheet on a letter and send it to us and 6 say: investigate that. Which to me is not: please 7 conduct investigations under terms of section such and 8 such and investigate the following, which is the normal 9 10 manner in which we get it. Some of the other items that you identified there in relation to going about race, 11 12 obviously examination of the -- you know, were any of 13 the nine principal officers involved in the incident 14 involving the three officers in Fife. That was areas 15 that we looked at. That was an area, you know, that we looked at. Did I see that at that time? Or when I saw 16 17 that? I don't know. My recollection is that the first 18 that the family raised the area of race was at the 19 meeting with the Commissioner, which is just a couple of 20 days after that. I think -- is that dated 31 August? 21 Q. That is 31 July. 22 Oh, 31 July. So we are actually, sorry, a month later. Α. The letter is -- both letters are 31 July from Mr Anwar. 23 Q. 24 Α. Yes.

25 Q. The Crown Office instruction letter is dated 24 August.

1		So his letters are 31 July. The Crown get in touch with
2		the Commissioner on 24 August.
3	Α.	24 August.
4	Q.	Yes.
5	Α.	Then there was a meeting with the family just was it
6		a week after that? The first couple of days
7	Q.	I think the beginning of September. I am about to say
8		the 2nd, but I might be wrong.
9	A.	My recollection is the 2nd. Sorry, I'm just
10		I don't have my daybook there for that date.
11	Q.	We have your daybook if that would assist you. It is
12		PIRC 04521. Unfortunately I think it is on screen
13		rather than hard copy.
14	Α.	Sorry. Thank you.
15	Q.	But if we look for 2 September, which will be towards
16		the end of that book. Sorry, I don't have a page number
17		to give you at this stage.
18	Α.	Yes, and yes, I understand about the meeting on
19		2 September and that is where to the best of my
20		recollection, that was the first that the family
21		raised certainly with myself about the matter of
22		race. What would be interesting to see is the page of
23		when the letter was received by the Commissioner.
24	Q.	I think what we may be better doing, rather than
25		scrolling through the screen hoping to spot something,

1		is to get a hard copy for you, Mr Little, and we will do
2		that overnight. Can we look at the policy log. This
3		might be of some assistance as well. This is
4		PIRC 04153. If we can look at item 64.
5	Α.	Thank you.
6	Q.	You will see this is an entry made on 25 August, so the
7		day after the Crown Office letter we have been looking
8		at.
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	It is an instruction from Crown Office: investigate all
11		the circumstances set out in the letter from Mr Anwar to
12		Crown Office. But you will recall that the letter that
13		was attached to the Crown Office instruction was the one
14		that Mr Anwar sent to the Chief Constable?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	The four-page letter.
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	But:
19		"In this regard the Inquiry will now progress the
20		following main lines of Inquiry and actions will be
21		raised accordingly.
22		"1. Race. Examine whether race or racism,
23		institutional racism with the Fife area of Police
24		Scotland and in the approach of individual officers
25		played any part in or impacted on how officers dealt

1 with Sheku Bayoh.

"2. In pursuance of the last, examine the PSD ...." 2 3 That is Professional Standards Department: "... of officers involved in incident for racist or 4 5 discriminating behaviour and report accordingly. "3. Examine the PSD history of PC Alan Paton and 6 7 historic incidents/allegations of assault. "4. Undertake an audit of Police Scotland IT 8 systems operational in Fife to determine if the nine 9 10 officers or any officers unlawfully accessed the [data] of the persons named in the letter. 11 12 "5. Correspond with Mr Anwar setting out Scottish 13 position in law regarding conferring, collusion, 14 resignation, compulsion about providing statements, IPCC 15 position contrasted with PIRC Scottish system." Can we look at the start of that? If that was seen 16 17 as the instruction from Crown Office, which is noted by John McSporran on the day after the letter is sent, 18 25 August? 19 20 A. Yes. Q. And he mentions race and racist issues to be 21 investigated, that presumably must have come from the 22 letter that Aamer Anwar sent direct to the Commissioner? 23 24 Α. Yes. Q. Rather than the terms of reference in the letter of 25

1		instruction from the Crown to PIRC?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	So it has been interpreted at some point by Mr McSporran
4		that, as of that date, PIRC were instructed by Crown to
5		investigate race; is that fair to say?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	And that is probably based on the letter that Mr Anwar
8		sent PIRC dated 31 July, and I say that advisedly. That
9		is the letter he sent to PIRC dated 31 July?
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	So this would have been the first point at which it was
12		recognised that the family through Mr Anwar were
13		concerned about race and, although there seems to have
14		been some mix up here with the letters, from that stage
15		PIRC were instructed or considered themselves instructed
16		by the Crown to investigate race?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	Right. Thank you. As a result of that, it would appear
19		from the daybook at least that certain steps were then
20		instigated in relation to investigating race?
21	A.	Sorry, from my daybook?
22	Q.	From this daybook it appears that PIRC were then
23		certain steps were ordered in relation to investigating
24		these issues of race.
25	Α.	Right, but not on 25 August, for myself.

1	LOR	D BRACADALE: I think here we are talking about the
2		policy log rather than
3	A.	The policy log. Because I was down in London on
4		25 August.
5	MS	GRAHAME: Sorry, I realise that. I have made a mistake.
6		I am talking about the document on the screen, which is
7		the policy log.
8	Α.	Yes. Thank you. I understand that.
9	Q.	My mistake. So at least from 25 August and the entry in
10		the policy log by John McSporran he took the view that
11		PIRC were now instructed to investigate race?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	And that that then resulted in certain actions being
14		required. So it was from this moment that PIRC started
15		to pursue particular lines of investigation directed
16		towards the issue of race?
17	Α.	Okay. So over the passage of time, I apologise, I have
18		made a mistake in my Rule 8 in respect of that. I
19		lifted that from the whether that was a mistake, me
20		lifting that date from the such but my recollection
21		is, for myself, the first that the matter of race was
22		raised that I was aware of and I take I fully take
23		that, was on the meeting with Ms Frame on $\dots$ I think
24		the 2nd. I can see certainly just looking quickly
25		looking at my statement that I made, my second statement

1 I made to Crown, that I was away on the 25th. I was down in London, actually meeting with Dr Karch on that 2 3 date. So I wasn't about on 25 August. Where I was on 4 the days after that, it is not quite clear here, 5 although I certainly have on Friday, 28 August, I handed CCTV footage over to Mr Brown. But that is my 6 7 recollection, yes. I'm not doubting that. I'm not doubting that. 8

Q. Then can we look at COPFS 02557. This is another letter 9 10 from the Crown. There might be a slight glitch with the computer. We can resolve that tomorrow. But 11 12 essentially my understanding is that there was 13 a subsequent letter sent by the Crown, which I will be 14 able to show you tomorrow, sent to the Commissioner, 15 dated 2 September. I think if we look at your Inquiry statement, paragraph 222, there's reference to this. So 16 17 it's paragraph 222 of 421. You will see there, if we can go back to 221 actually, we can see reference to the 18 19 letter:

20 "On 2 September Crown Office wrote to the
21 Commissioner. Were you aware of this correspondence at
22 the time or subsequently?"

And you do recall this further instruction. Then we can move on to the next paragraph, paragraph 222: "The letter asked the Commissioner to confirm that

1		issues of race and whether there was any evidence of
2		racial motivation was a primary focus in the PIRC
3		investigation."
4		And your response is:
5		"I have no recollection as to what I understood back
6		in 2015. What I can confirm is that from the outset the
7		matter of race was under consideration at all times."
8		But my understanding is and we will be able to
9		look at this tomorrow the Commissioner put in writing
10		a query whether evidence of racial motivation was
11		a primary focus in the PIRC investigation and,
12		regardless of any mistakes or confusion
13	A.	Yes, yes.
14	Q.	that had arisen previously, this was the first letter
15		from the Crown that specifically raised the issue of
16		race and asked PIRC to investigate?
17	A.	Okay. So it was much later than what I yes.
18	Q.	Would you accept that that could have been a point at
19		which
20	Α.	Yes, yes.
21	Q.	there was a formal letter or a formal correspondence
22		from Crown asking about the issue of race?
23	A.	Yes. And I do see in my response to 221 I am able to
24		say that a number of actions were detailed were
25		handed out on or were raised on 8 September in

	response to that.
Q.	Is this in the policy log
Α.	No, no. In my response to question 221.
Q.	I see:
	"I do recall this further instruction. The changes
	it made is that each of the points was allocated out for
	action to number of the [members] of the investigation
	team detailed within my daybook entries dated
	8 September 2015."
	So there were actions taken after that instruction?
Α.	Yes, instructions, yes.
Q.	Then you will see as we move down the page that there is
	a reference at 223 to a meeting that took place
A.	Yes, this is the meeting I was talking about. Yes
Q.	between the Commissioner and the family, their
	solicitor, John Mitchell, Alistair Lewis, Michael Tait
	and yourself, Mr Little?
A.	Yes.
Q.	And that was on 3 September?
Α.	Yes.
MS	GRAHAME: We will come on to that and the different
	aspects.
	I wonder if that might be an appropriate time to
	break?
LOR	D BRACADALE: Yes. We will stop there and continue the
	А. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. MS

1	evidence tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.
2	(4.13 pm)
3	(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Wednesday,
4	14 February 2024)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2	MR WILLIAM LITTLE1	
3	(continued)	
4	Questions from MS GRAHAME1	
5	(continued)	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		