1 Wednesday, 19 June 2024 2 (10.00 am)3 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Ms Taylor, would you say the words of the affirmation after me, please. 4 Evidence of MS FIONA TAYLOR (affirmed) 5 Examination-in-chief by MS GRAHAME 6 7 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Good morning. You are Fiona 8 9 Taylor. 10 Α. Yes. And you joined Police Scotland in July 2018, as I 11 Q. 12 understand? 13 Yes, that's correct. Α. 14 What rank were you when you joined? Q. 15 Α. When I joined Police Scotland, I joined in the rank of Deputy Chief Constable. 16 And where had you come from? 17 Q. So my policing career is quite varied. It began in 1993 18 Α. 19 in Lincolnshire, where I joined as a Constable under the 20 auspices of the Accelerated Promotion Scheme for 21 graduates. I spent my first ten years in Lincolnshire. I then transferred on promotion to Superintendent to 22 legacy Lothian and Borders Police. I was a 23 Superintendent and Chief Superintendent in Lothian and 24 Borders. I then qualified through the Strategic Command 25

1 Course to be appointable as an Assistant Chief Constable and I was indeed appointed as an Assistant Chief 2 3 Constable to legacy Strathclyde Police in 2009. I 4 served in Strathclyde until 2012 when I applied for and 5 was successful to be appointed as a Deputy Assistant Commissioner, the equivalent of Deputy Chief Constable 6 7 in Scotland, with the Metropolitan Police Service. I served with the Met in the ranks of DAC and 8 Assistant Commissioner, temporary Assistant 9 10 Commissioner, the equivalent of Chief Constable in Scotland until December 2017 when I resigned from the 11 12 Met. I then spent six months in sort of retirement and 13 then rejoined policing, as you say, counsel, in 14 July 2018 as a Deputy Chief Constable with 15 Police Scotland. Now, we've been advised by Police Scotland that you have 16 Q. 17 had an extensive career and hit many high spots, if I can put it that way. I wondered if you would like the 18 opportunity to provide the Inquiry with your more 19 20 detailed CV. 21 If you have -- I appreciate you have retired now, but if you would like to provide that information, 22 I think that would be helpful. 23 A. I can certainly do that, but what I would say is it has 24 been a privilege to serve as a police officer, but I 25

1

will certainly provide you with that more detailed CV, 2 counsel. Thank you very much. 3 Q. 4 Α. Thank you. 5 Now, you transferred, as I understand it, to -- in Q. Police Scotland, to the People and Professionalism 6 7 Portfolio, within a few months of your appointment, so you joined Police Scotland in July 2018? 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. And within a few months you were appointed to the People and Professionalism Portfolio. Can you explain to us 11 12 what that encompassed? 13 Yes, certainly. When I joined Police Scotland, I joined Α. 14 as the local policing Deputy Chief Constable. We then 15 had a number of retirements and the like and I moved into what was then the newly created People and 16 17 Professionalism Portfolio. The Portfolio was 18 responsible for professionalism, all aspects of 19 professionalism within Police Scotland, and was also at 20 that point in time responsible for what would commonly 21 be known as the human resources element of 22 Police Scotland, the people element of Police Scotland. Additionally, I had responsibility for legal 23 services, for strategy and policy, and also for 24 corporate communications, but the Chief Constable asked 25

me in particular to concentrate on the corporate centre of Police Scotland to ensure that the activity that the organisation engaged in was ethical, it was driven by a respect for our values or fairness, integrity, respect and an absolute commitment to upholding human rights.

The Professionalism Portfolio, whilst it had professional standards in it, also has governance and assurance in it, so those quality assurance elements of our policing activity, many of those sat within the professionalism portfolio as well.

- Q. And as Deputy Chief Constable, am I right in saying that you are immediately underneath the Chief Constable in terms of the hierarchy?
- A. So I was appointed under the auspices of the Police and
  Fire Reform Act as the designated Deputy Chief Constable
  at around about the same time that I moved into the
  People and Professionalism Portfolio. We have a flat -in Police Scotland at the moment, we have a flat
  structure underneath the Chief Constable, so it wasn't
  as if I had responsibility for the other deputies in any
  sort of shape or form, it was simply that should the
  Chief Constable be incapacitated in any way, then it
  would have been my responsibility to step up and step
  into that role in an interim basis and, indeed, that's
  what I did when the Chief Constable retired in

- 1 August 2023 for those sort of intervening months between
- 2 the new Chief Constable joining us and Sir Iain
- 3 retiring.
- 4 Q. So the Chief Constable, there's one Chief Constable of
- 5 Police Scotland?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. He is at the top of the organisation?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And beneath that there are a number of Deputy Chief
- 10 Constables, DCCs?
- 11 A. That's right.
- 12 Q. And if the situation arises, there will be one
- designated DCC and that was you?
- 14 A. That's absolute right, but again, just to be absolutely
- 15 accurate, as well as the three Deputy Chief Constables,
- when I was serving, we also had a Deputy Chief officers
- 17 who was the most senior member of police staff, the most
- senior civilian within Police Scotland, who was largely
- 19 responsible for corporate services.
- Q. Thank you. So there's one Chief Constable, and thinking
- 21 only of officers --
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. -- there's three deputy Chief Constables?
- 24 A. That's right.
- 25 Q. And of those three one is designated and that was you?

- 1 A. That's right.
- Q. And that allows you or it requires you to step into the
- 3 shoes of the Chief Constable if he is as on the occasion
- 4 of Sir Iain Livingstone retiring or if they become
- 5 incapacitated or unwell in some way?
- 6 A. That's right.
- 7 Q. And you remained in that Professionalism Portfolio until
- 8 August of 2023; is that right?
- 9 A. That's right, counsel, yes.
- 10 Q. And then in August 2023, the Chief Constable at the time
- 11 Sir Iain Livingstone retired?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And you became the designate interim Chief Constable and
- 14 until the current Chief Constable, Jo Farrell, took up
- post?
- 16 A. Yes, that's right.
- Q. And that was in October of 2023?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And from October 2023 until February 2024, you remained
- 20 DCC designate?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. And you had a key role, as I understand your statement,
- in supporting the current Chief Constable Farrell's
- induction, if you can put it that way, into
- Police Scotland?

- 1 A. Yes, that's absolutely correct.
- 2 Q. Thank you. And you then retired from Police Scotland on
- 3 9 February 2024?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Thank you. Before I get into your evidence at this
- 6 stage, I understand that you would like to say a few
- 7 words with the permission of the Chair.
- 8 A. That's correct. Thank you. Thank you, sir.
- 9 I just wanted to pass on my deepest condolences for
- 10 the loss of a beloved son and brother in May 2015, and I
- 11 also just wanted to thank you for the dignity, the
- 12 tenacity, and the absolute generosity of spirit that you
- as a family have displayed and your generosity towards
- me personally in terms of being prepared to interact and
- to listen and to talk with Police Scotland.
- I can't thank you enough and I just thought it was,
- with the indulgence of the Chair, the right thing to do
- this morning just to recognise that so thank you.
- 19 Q. Thank you very much. So in your portfolio as designated
- DCC, you have said that you were responsible for issues
- 21 regarding legal services?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And am I to understand that in fact you took
- 24 responsibility for Police Scotland's engagement with
- 25 this Inquiry?

- 1 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 2 Q. And if I remember correctly, you have attended on a
- 3 number of days and you're briefed by the legal team in
- 4 relation to the work of the Inquiry?
- 5 A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. You are also, you said, responsible for professional
- 7 standards?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Or were responsible and for conduct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And governance --
- 12 A. That's right.
- 13 Q. -- I think you said as well?
- 14 A. That's right. Conduct, as I think I said in my
- 15 statement, is further delegated to an Assistant Chief
- 16 Constable who has day-to-day responsibility for the work
- of the complaints and conduct function, but, ultimately,
- it sat within my portfolio, that's absolutely correct.
- 19 Q. Thank you.
- A. Thank you.
- 21 Q. Let's look at -- first of all, I know you're aware of
- 22 evidence in the Inquiry. You will know there is a blue
- folder sitting in front of you and you will probably
- have heard me say to many other witnesses that should
- 25 contain a copy of your statement.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And any other documents that you may find to be of
- 3 assistance during the course of your evidence.
- 4 A. Thank you.
- 5 Q. If there is something you would like to see but you do
- 6 not have a hard copy, if you let me know, we will try
- 7 and get it for you.
- 8 A. Thank you.
- 9 Q. We may not have it immediately on the playlist to show
- on the screen, but we will try and get it at the next
- 11 break.
- 12 A. Thank you.
- Q. Please feel free to use that folder as you wish. Let's
- go through what's brought us here. You were sent a
- Rule 8 request by the Inquiry. Maybe we can have that
- up on the screen. That was from the 28 March this year,
- so the month after you retired; do you see that?
- 18 A. I do.
- 19 Q. And as with other witnesses, this is a written request
- from the Inquiry and if we scroll through, you'll see
- 21 that a number of questions were asked and you were
- 22 requested to write down the answers and provide what's
- 23 known as a Rule 8 response. Do you recognise what we
- see on the screen?
- 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And you did that, and your Rule 8 response, which is the 2 equivalent of an Inquiry statement, is SBPI 00546, and 3 you'll see that this says "Witness Statement Fiona 4 Taylor QPM" and that's dated, if he look at the end of 5 that, final page, you'll see that although it's been redacted and doesn't show on the screen, you should see 6 7 a copy yourself and that was signed by you? Yes. 8 Α. And sent to the Inquiry and that was dated 22 April 9 Q. 10 2024? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. And the final paragraph of that statement, paragraph 31, 13 says: 14 "I believe the facts stated in this witness 15 statement are true. I understand that this statement may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be 16 17 published on the Inquiry's website." 18 And you understood that to be the case when you sent 19 it in? 20 A. I did. 21 Q. And that entire statement will be available to the Chair 22 for consideration. Could we go back to the top of that document. I'm interested in paragraph 2, please. And 23 we see here you say: 24 "I had line management responsibility for 25

1 ACC Professionalism, who had delegated from the Chief Constable day-to-day responsibility for professional 2 3 standards. I had regular meetings with then ACC Spiers 4 who held this portfolio to understand emerging trends 5 and themes in respect of misconduct and complaints. Also, I ensured we were aware of national trends, events 6 7 and were responding to national reviews and reports." So you say there -- you mention an ACC Spiers? 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. And you say you had line-management responsibility, for ACC Professionalism. First of all, who was 11 12 ACC Professionalism? 13 That is ACC Spiers. Α. ACC Spiers. and you say you had line-management 14 Q. 15 responsibility for him? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Q. And you say: "Who had delegated from the Chief Constable 18 19 day-to-day responsibility for professional standards." Yes. I may have technically got that slightly wrong. 20 Α. 21 That delegation might actually have come from myself as 22 a designated deputy as opposed to the Chief. My apologies, I'm not as au fait with the Police and Fire 23 Reform Act as I might have been. 24 Q. I wanted to ask you about that. So the Chief Constable 25

- in a sense has appointed you?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. You're a designate DCC and you then have line-management responsibility for ACC Spiers and he is the ACC for professionalism?
- 6 A. Yes.
- Q. Is that effectively covering conduct, misconduct, that type of thing?
- 9 A. It does. It covers exactly that, counsel, covers
  10 conduct, misconduct, the discipline portfolio, but also
  11 covers governance and assurance as well.
- Q. "And he had day-to-day responsibility for professional standards" and now you would like to correct that, that's come from you, that delegation.
- 15 A. Thank you.
- 16 Q. I would like to ask you about the 2014 Regulations and
  17 if we have those on the screen, they're SBPI 00633.
  18 Now, you have mentioned the 2012 Act and I'm sure you'll
  19 agree the Scottish ministers made regulations in
  20 exercise of the powers conferred under the Police and
  21 Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012 and those regulations
- are the ones we see on the screen now so they're the
- Police Service Of Scotland (Conduct) Regulations 2014.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And they were in place when you took on the role.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And they came into force on 1 April 2014, so that was
- 3 the year after Police Scotland came into existence.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. One year exactly after they came into existence, and you
- joined in 2018 and they were still in force at that
- 7 time.
- 8 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 9 Q. And am I right in saying they remained in force
- 10 throughout your entire time?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Thank you. And these regulations apply, as they say in
- the brackets there, to issues of conduct and they apply
- 14 to issues of conduct on the part of Constables below the
- rank of Assistant Chief Constable?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- Q. So would that include Constables obviously, but
- 18 sergeants?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Inspectors?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Anyone up to but not including Assistant Chief
- 23 Constable?
- A. That's correct, everybody up to the rank of Chief
- 25 Superintendent.

So both yourself and ACC Spiers were above the rank of 1 Q. 2 anyone who would be covered by these conduct 3 regulations? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. And if we look at the interpretation regulation 2 and if we could look at the word "conduct" which we see there 6 7 on the screen: "Conduct includes acts and omissions." 8 9 So really it doesn't specify or limit the type of conduct that can be covered? 10 11 A. No. 12 Q. It's simply something that is done or something that is 13 not done; is that correct? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. And then if we look at the definition of "gross misconduct", it says: 16 "Means a breach of the standards of professional 17 behaviour so serious that demotion in rank or dismissal 18 may be justified." 19 20 So that would be a very particular serious type of 21 misconduct? 22 A. Yes. Q. And we see the definition of the word misconduct: 23 24 "Unless the context otherwise requires, conduct which amounts to a breach of the standards of 25

1

otherwise requires, include gross misconduct." 2 3 So again, misconduct is defined under reference 4 again to the standards of professional behaviour? 5 Α. Yes. And these were set out in Schedule 1 of the Regulations. 6 Q. 7 So if we look at the rear of this document, we'll see Schedule 1 of the Regulations. 8 9 Tell us what the standards are. We'll go throughout 10 the specifics in a moment, but could you explain to everyone listening what these are for a police officer. 11 12 So these -- at risk possibly of repeating the title, Α. 13 these are the standards of behaviour to which every 14 police officer, including those above the rank of Chief 15 Superintendent, should rightly be held when they go about their day-to-day responsibilities as a police 16 17 officer, but also be held to when they're not actively 18 on duty so these are the standards of behaviour which, 19 if you like, govern the activity of serving police 20 officers. 21 Q. And that's every police officer? 22 That's every police officer, yes. Α. And it's not just those on duty, off duty as well? 23 Q. So the standards of professional behaviour also have an 24 Α. 25 impact on how officers comport themselves off duty, yes.

professional behavior, but does not, unless the context

- Q. And we've heard that police officers are in a unique
  position in society. They are permitted to use lawful
  force in relation to other citizens in the country, that
  that can in certain circumstances include deadly force,
  but there are obligations and privileges and
  responsibilities attached to that role of police
- 6 responsibilities attached to that role of police 7 officer; is that fair?
- 8 A. That's very fair, yes.
- 9 Q. And the standards to which officers are held, are these 10 set out in Schedule 1 of the Regulations?
- Yes, and it was certainly a focus of the Policing 11 Α. 12 Together Programme, which I'm sure we will touch on 13 later, through the auspices of our Professional 14 Standards Department to ensure that we could bring these 15 standards of professional behaviour to life for our colleagues so that they weren't just sitting in a set of 16 17 regulations or a regulatory framework, but they were actually given a practical applicability in terms of how 18 officers behaved on a day-to-day basis. 19
- Q. Right. So these are not dusty regulations left on a shelf, they mean something?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. They're important, they're significant to officers?
- A. That's absolutely correct.
- 25 Q. And is it fair to say that Police Scotland expects the

officers to comply with these standards, have regard to 1 2 these standards in the course of their duties at the 3 very least? 4 Α. Yes. I would like to look at some of them. We won't go 5 Q. through all of them. 6 7 Α. Okay. Q. Can I look at the equality and diversity standard: 8 9 "Constables act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly." 10 So that's quite a widely drawn standard? 11 12 Α. Yes. Q. Would that include a standard that officers should not 13 act in a discriminatory manner such as racial 14 15 discrimination? 16 A. Absolutely. 17 And they should not act in a discriminatory manner in Q. relation to religion? 18 That's correct. 19 Α. 20 Would it essentially be anything to do -- we've heard of Q. 21 characteristics under the Equalities Act? 22 Α. Yes. Anything along those lines, would that be covered by 23 Q. 24 this standard?

That's absolutely correct, but I think the first half of

25

Α.

1 the standard, "not discriminating unlawfully or unfairly", is absolutely fundamental to our contract 2 3 with the citizens of Scotland. We have to maintain the 4 confidence of every community in Scotland to be able to 5 police with consent, so that's absolutely fundamental, but also fairness and impartiality is actually about a 6 7 mindset as well, counsel, and almost a protected characteristic or none, treat everybody with dignity and 8 respect, treat them fairly and consider in the broadest 9 10 sense their needs and requirements. Thank you. And if there are failings in relation to 11 Q. 12 these standards, is it through -- via the Regulations 13 that consideration is given to the extent of any failing 14 to meet the standards and to what punishment or sanction 15 should be applied, if there has been a failing? Yes, if the standards of professional behaviour aren't 16 Α. 17 met, then there will be an assessment carried out around the gravity, if you like, of an individual's failure to 18 meet those standards of professional behaviour. 19 20 Now, what I would say is there is an absolute zero 21 tolerance within Police Scotland for any discrimination, 22 be that racist discrimination or any other type. However, officers can on occasion make mistakes, so it's 23 only correct that if an officer makes a mistake which is 24 25 made genuinely with no malice, there is no malevolence,

1 there is no forethought, then it's as important the organisation tries to reeducate that individual, in 2 3 other words provide them with supplementary or 4 additional training, support, guidance, supervision to 5 ensure that they are not making those mistakes again. But as I say, there's a continuum, if you like. 6 7 If somebody makes an honest mistake and it's at the lower end of the continuum, then absolutely we would 8 9 look to reeducate, support, retrain, additional 10 supervision, but if there is any deliberate attempt to discriminate, if there's any dishonest then that would 11 12 absolutely breach the standards of professional behaviour and there would be an assessment made by 13 14 colleagues in Professional Standards to understand how 15 that should be taken forward. Q. Is there an assessment carried out by Police Scotland, 16 17 an initial assessment, to decide whether this is a 18 simple mistake, an honest mistake, which can be resolved 19 through reeducation or there is some deliberate 20 discriminatory behaviour? 21 Α. Yes. And who carries out that assessment? 22 Q. A. So those assessments would be carried out by colleagues 23 within PSD. There are officers within PSD who deal with 24 complaints and other who deal with conduct matters and, 25

25

Α.

Yes.

1 clearly, breaching the standard of professional behaviour would often result in a conduct issue being 2 3 raised, so those assessments would be done by colleagues 4 in Professional Standards. 5 So we've heard about your role, we've heard about Q. 6 AC Spiers, who were the colleagues that would make these 7 assessments? A. So within the Professional Standards Department, when I 8 9 was there, this may have changed in the meantime, there 10 were different elements in different sections, if you like, within Professional Standards. So there was an 11 12 anticorruption unit, there was a specialist 13 investigations unit, there was a unit which dealt with 14 complaints from the public, there was also a unit which 15 dealt with conduct matters raised within the 16 organisation. 17 Now, sometimes these responsibilities overlapped and 18 it was probably, you know, in terms of understanding 19 exactly what that looks like in 2024, it may have 20 changed since my time, but there would certainly be 21 officers within the -- with responsibilities within PSD 22 to address matters of police officer conduct. Q. At that stage, if there was an issue which came to the 23 attention of Police Scotland --24

20

- 1 Q. -- it could go to the Professional Standards Department?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And someone within one of these particular units could
- 4 carry out an initial assessment and that initial
- 5 assessment could be -- could result in deviating the
- 6 matter away from these regulations towards some sort of
- 7 reeducation?
- 8 A. Yes, given the -- every set of circumstances is
- 9 different, every set of circumstances will be
- investigated on its merits, on the, you know, particular
- incident or series of incidents, yes.
- 12 Q. And in terms of that process, that's outwith these
- Regulations, is there policies or procedures that we
- 14 could look at that would help us understand what
- standards are being applied, what rationale is being
- 16 considered, what reasoning there is for the decision?
- 17 A. So in terms of the interdependencies, yes, we will
- have -- and again, the reason I'm hesitating slightly is
- 19 these things are iterative, there's a lot of
- organisation, the learning and development going on
- 21 within Police Scotland in terms of standard operating
- 22 procedures and policies, but I'm sure we will be able to
- 23 provide the Inquiry with the relevant policies to assist
- 24 the Inquiry to understand the interaction between the
- 25 regulations and the standards of professional behaviour.

- 1 Q. The assessments carried out within standards will they
  2 be subject to a standard operating procedure or a policy
- 3 of some kind in terms of that initial assessment?
- A. I believe they will, yes, and there will also be

  overview and scrutiny by more senior officers within the

  complaints and conduct department as well, sergeants or

  inspectors.
- Q. And it there a record of that assessment and the outcome of that assessment?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. That would be kept. And who would keep that?
- 12 Α. Again, that would be kept within, I would anticipate, 13 and again this may have changed, but there was also a 14 governance function within Professional Standards in its 15 own right. What we would try to do would be, and I think I may be reference it in the statement, is to 16 17 understand where themes may be emerging so it was really important that we would keep a record of any breaches of 18 the standards of professional behavior or indeed any 19 20 other conduct issues which came to the attention of 21 Police Scotland so that we could understand whether, if 22 a theme was emerging, did that mean that there was a 23 deficit in some of the training that we were providing 24 to probationers say. Was there a lacuna, something we just didn't understand and were consistently getting 25

- 1 that wrong and as a consequence potentially breaching the standards or transgressing the conduct regulations. 2 3 So really important that we did keep a record, that 4 we did understand the themes that were emerging and then 5 we could go back into the organisation to try to 6 remediate any of those behaviours, prevent them from 7 happening again. Q. I am keen to avoid any confusion between standards and 8 9 the Regulations and assessment of any themes arising out of those, so cases are situations that are dealt with 10 under the Regulations, leave that to one side at the 11 12 moment. 13 Α. Okay. 14 And only look at this assessment which is done outwith Q. 15 the scope of the Regulations. You've said that a 16 decision and assessment is made by someone within police 17 Professional Standards and is there a record of those 18 assessments? 19 I can't say definitively in terms of records of Α. 20 assessment. I think they would be kept, but I would 21 need to check that for you or have that checked. 22 Who keeps -- who monitors or keeps an eye on how many Q. 23 non-regulation matters are being dealt with by 24 Professional Standards?
  - A. So that would be the senior management team within PSD.

25

- Q. And in terms of their ultimate responsibility for the senior management team, who do they answer to?
- A. ACC -- well, the ACC Professionalism who was at that time ACC Spiers.
- 5 Q. Spiers, who is ultimately -- you were responsible for 6 him?
- 7 A. That's right.
- Q. So in terms of you and your role as DCC, what
  information were you provided with about these
  non-regulation assessments that were carried out?
- 11 So prominently two areas. If there was a particularly Α. 12 egregious incident involving a police officer, then 13 I would be made aware of that. Alan and I, ACC Spiers 14 and I spoke on a daily basis. We would talk everyday 15 about themes emerging, trends, issues, come back after the weekend, any incidents that occurred over the 16 17 weekend for arguments sake. So there was the issue of the seriousness or severity of any incident or 18 19 incidents, but then, as I say, there was also the issue 20 of are we starting to see sort of themes or -- trends 21 emerging or themes developing and, again, we would 22 discuss that on a one-to-one basis, but we would also discuss that in  $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$  I created a forum within 23 Police Scotland which enabled Professional Standards, 24 25 Legal Services and colleagues in P & D to come together,

- again, just so that we had a corporate understanding of

  any issues such as the type that you mention, Council,

  so that, again, we would understand collectively what we

  might need to do about that.
  - Q. Again, I would like to draw a distinction between matters that are dealt with under the Regulations and matters that are dealt with outwith the Regulations, where there's this assessment, initial assessment, where you said it could be a mistake, an honest mistake, there could be reeducation. Those are diverted away from the Regulations and the framework that those provide.

So when you're talking about a particularly egregious example, were those particularly egregious examples also dealt with to assess whether they were honest mistakes?

- A. So they would always -- that is the purpose of the assessment process, to understand, you know, could this possibly have been an honest mistake or actually is there something more here and there have been -- as I say, if we take, for example, elements of or elements surrounding, you know, dishonesty or violence or drunkenness or particularly discrimination, then that would be dealt with formally post assessment.
- Q. So are there categories that we would look at that are identified by Police Scotland that if it falls within

1 this category, it must be dealt with under the Regulations or if it falls within this category, it can 2 3 be dealt with as an honest mistake? 4 Α. So you are at the absolute extent of my kind of working 5 knowledge of the practices within the Professional Standards Department, but there will always be advice 6 7 and guidance for investigators. The skills and experiences of those investigators would play into the 8 9 decisions that they would make, but, as I say, there 10 would also be oversight and scrutiny from more senior officers within Professional Standards, whether those be 11 12 sergeants, inspectors, chief inspectors. 13 So I appreciate I'm probably not saying 14 definitively, yes, there are, but what I am saying is if 15 they are in their current incarnation or current iteration, we can certainly get those to the Inquiry. 16 Thank you. Is it fair to say that if the matter 17 Q. involved the death of someone after coming into police 18 contact that that would not be one of those honest 19 20 mistake issues, it would be an issue that would be 21 covered within the Regulations? So I think if somebody dies following police conduct, 22 Α. then I mean that's an incredibly serious set of 23 circumstances, so there would be a full investigation, 24 as you know, carried out into the death of any person or 25

1 indeed serious injury of any person following police conduct. That investigation would be carried out by the 2 3 PIRC and, as consequence of the investigation carried 4 out by the PIRC, the conclusions that the PIRC would reach in terms of the culpability, for want of a better 5 word, of any police officer involved in that -- those 6 7 set of circumstances might go one of any -- one of a number of ways, counsel, but that is -- and again, back 8 9 to our bond of trust and confidence with the communities 10 of Scotland, the Article 2 rights of any individual and the necessity for a thorough investigation, the 11 12 investigation would take place and then, as a 13 consequence of the findings from that investigation, a 14 determination follow-up. 15 Q. And that would include the provisions under these Regulations? 16 Yes, if -- yes, yes. 17 Α. 18 Q. And then if we can move on and look at the use of force: 19 "Constables use force only to the extent that it is 20 necessary, proportionate and reasonable in all the 21 circumstances." And that reflects evidence that we've heard about 22 what officers are taught under the OST Manual and things 23 of that sort? 24 25 A. Yes. And again, it's probably worthy of note just to --

1 and I'm sure colleagues have already expressed this much more articulately than I could, operational safety 2 3 training is constantly evolving, the elements or 4 operational safety training change based on previous 5 experience and our understanding in terms of verbal-conflict deescalation training for colleagues 6 7 within our C3 environment, so that again is a very iterative process, operational safety training. 8 Q. But the law remains this constant that Constables are 9 10 only allowed to use force and force is only lawful to the extent that it is necessary, proportionate and 11 12 reasonable in the circumstances? 13 Yes. Α. Q. And then: 14 15 "Orders and instructions. Constables give and carry out only lawful orders and instructions." 16 17 So Constables have to carry out instructions, lawful instructions, from their superiors? 18 19 Yes. Α. And then if we can move down to "discreditable conduct": 20 Q. 21 "Constables behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public 22 confidence in it whether on or off duty." 23 24 So Constables have to behave in a manner not just that complies with the other standards, but they also 25

1 have to regard to things that don't discredit the police service or bring it into disrepute, if I can put it that 2 3 way? 4 Α. That is absolutely correct and, again, it is a matter of 5 the confidence in the police service in Scotland. Thank you. Can we look at misconduct allegation. 6 Q. I think that might be in the interpretation section, 7 which is Regulation 2, "Misconduct Allegation" -- there 8 9 we are. It's on the screen -- means: 10 "Any report allegation or complaint from which it can reasonably be inferred that any conduct of the 11 12 constable may amount to misconduct or gross misconduct." And can I take that it's not necessary for there to 13 14 be a form or a formal letter raising issues of 15 misconduct in order for Police Scotland to deal with the -- address the matter? 16 I mean that's absolutely correct and one of the areas 17 Α. that we really have tried to improve on is accessibility 18 19 for members of the public to access the complaints 20 system, so there are a number of different methods by 21 which a complaint about an officer's conduct can be 22 raised. Q. Right. And so if something is even if brought to the 23 attention of the police, can that be dealt with as a 24 25 possible conduct issue?

10

22

23

24

25

- 1 Α. For arguments sake, if that's reported by a member of the public to a passing police officer who's not 2 3 involved -- and again, I'm just trying to create a 4 scenario here so that I hope I'm answering your 5 question. If a member of the public comes into a police station or reports to another police officers or a 6 7 member of police staff that a particular issue has occurred then, yes, absolutely that should be noted and 8 acted upon. 9
  - Q. Does it have to be reported to a police officer?
- So again, more recently, there are alternative reporting 11 Α. 12 methodologies direct to the PIRC, for example, 13 potentially into Crown if there's, you know, really 14 serious allegations of assault made against a police 15 officer, and we have -- this isn't potentially used that frequently, but there are third-party reporting 16 17 mechanisms, for example, to report hate crime, which could also be utilised if a member of the public wants 18 to make a complaint about a police officer but doesn't 19 20 necessarily feel sufficiently confident to make that 21 complaint to the Scottish police service itself.
  - Q. That's one route, complain to any police officer and that should be dealt with. What if a complaint is made to the press or in public, is that something that the Police Scotland have regard to and deal with?

1 Α. Yes. Not even a complaint to a police officer that's 2 Q. 3 required? So, no, no, absolutely, if a complaint was made in the 4 Α. 5 press, then, you know, we would look to -- with the appropriate safeguards, we would look to follow that 6 7 complaint or those concerns up with the relevant individuals. 8 Q. Thank you. Could we look at Regulation 5 now, please. 9 10 There we are: 11 "Designation of Deputy Police Constable. 12 "5.1. The Chief Constable must designate a Deputy Chief Constable to exercise functions under these 13 14 regulations and references in these regulations to the 15 Deputy Chief Constable are ... unless the context otherwise requires references to that individual." 16 17 And I think you have said already you were that designated Deputy Chief Constable? 18 19 Yes. Α. 20 And it was your -- you were designated that role to Q. 21 exercise functions under these regulations? 22 Α. Yes. Q. And 2: 23 24 "The Deputy Chief Constable made direct or authorise another constable of at least the rank of 25

- Chief Inspector to carry out any of the Deputy Chief 1 Constable's functions under these regulations." and. 2 3 You've mentioned ACC Spiers. 4 Α. Yes. 5 And so the Deputy Chief Constable, yourself, may direct Q. or authorise another constable, ACC Spiers, to carry out 6 7 any of the functions under these Regulations? Yes. 8 Α. 9 Q. And then 3: "A direction or authorisation under paragraph 2 does 10 not affect the DCC's responsibility for the carrying out 11 12 of delegated function." 13 Yes. Α. 14 Does this confirm that ultimately you were responsible? Q. Ultimately, yes. 15 Α. Yes. So in terms of the wording of the Regulations, as 16 Q. 17 designated DCC, you had responsibility in terms of the Regulations? 18 19 Yes. Α. 20 And I think you said the ACC Spiers and you had a daily Q. 21 briefing? 22 We would speak daily. It was not always as formal as a Α.
- Q. So you worked very closely with ACC Spiers?

across the course of a day.

23

24

briefing and on occasion, counsel, it was many times

1 Α. Yes. Can I ask you briefly about the position from 2015 to 2 Q. 3 2018. Now, I understand you were not actually part of 4 Police Scotland at that time. But when you came to 5 Police Scotland in 2018, you took over that portfolio and I'm interested in your understanding of the position 6 7 prior to you immediately taking over that portfolio with regard to the Mr Bayoh's death. 8 9 So we have evidence that's been given to the Inquiry 10 that it was DCC Neil Richardson who would have had oversight at that time prior to you taking on this role; 11 12 is that correct? I think -- I think that is correct, but I'm conscious 13 Α. 14 that Neil Richardson retired from Police Scotland 15 sometime before I joined, counsel, so there may well have been another designated Deputy Chief Constable 16 17 in --18 Q. In between? 19 -- in between. Α. 20 Right. So there may have been someone in the period Q. shortly prior to you --21 22 Α. Yes. -- being appointed in 2018, but prior to that, would 23 Q. 24 that have been Neil Richardson?

That's my understanding, but it is just my

25

Α.

1 understanding. That's very helpful. And he would have been post in 2 Q. 3 that role in 2015, would he? Genuinely, I'm not sure of the dates of service of all 4 Α. 5 of my predecessors so just a note of caution there from 6 myself. 7 I'm sure we'll be able to find out from someone else. Q. We have a copy of a briefing paper which I would 8 9 like to look at first of all, PS 03545, and this was a briefing paper for your attention and it's dated 10 12 September 2018. Do you see that? And it's from 11 12 Superintendent Craig Blackhall and we understand he was 13 in the Professional Standards Department. And it 14 relates to the death of Mr Bayoh on 3 May 2015. 15 Now, was this the briefing paper you received regarding the death of Mr Bayoh when you took over in 16 17 relation to this portfolio? I can't remember, counsel, whether this was the briefing 18 Α. paper that I received or one of a number of briefing 19 20 papers. I genuinely can't remember. 21 Q. This is the only one that relates to Mr Bayoh, but 22 presumably that was not the only outstanding matter on 23 your desk when you took over the job. There must have 24 been other outstanding issues as well. A. There were, yes. 25

- Q. This would have been -- is it fair to say this would have been one of many briefing papers you received?
- 3 A. It would have been, yes, but I think even coming -- not
- 4 even coming, but coming from the Metropolitan Police
- 5 Service and coming from a position as the Deputy
- 6 Assistant Commissioner with responsibility for
- 7 Professional Standards in the Met and understanding the
- 8 implications and the impact on individuals and families
- 9 and public confidence of deaths in custody, the death of
- 10 Mr Bayoh, whilst, as you quite rightly say, may have
- 11 been one of a number of issues that I assumed
- 12 responsibility for, it would certainly have been
- something which was of really significant import.
- 14 Q. By the time you took on this role and even maybe before
- 15 you took on this role, you would have been aware of the
- death of Mr Bayoh?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And the significant of that?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And in fact, the death of Mr Bayoh is the only matter
- 21 that has resulted in a public inquiry that
- 22 Police Scotland are dealing with since that date?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And that in itself is a reflection of the importance of
- 25 the matter?

25

element of that?

1 Α. Yes. 2 And so you were aware of the issue, the death of Q. 3 Mr Bayoh, you would be aware of the concerns of the 4 family at that time, were you? 5 Yes, albeit not personally firsthand. Α. 6 No. Q. 7 I was fortunate to meet with the family shortly after I Α. came into Police Scotland along with the then Chief 8 9 Constable, Sir Iain Livingstone, which supported my 10 understanding of them as a family and the implications on them personally of the death of a loved one, but 11 12 I was also aware of the implications for the 13 organisation of the events of May 2015 as well. 14 And just if we go through this briefing paper and I Q. 15 simply want to skim through it to allow you to see what is. It deals with: 16 17 "The purpose of the briefing paper was to provide you with an update regarding the death of Mr Bayoh, the 18 PIRC investigation. The paper will be restricted to 19 20 aspects associated with the Professional Standards 21 Department and it was understood Fife Division would 22 provide a similar paper from an operation and staffing 23 perspective." 24 But we're interested in the Professional Standards

1	Α.	Okay.
2	Q.	You're given some information about the background, and
3		if we can sorry, can we just very quickly:
4		"About 7.15 hours on Sunday, 3 May, Police Scotland
5		received several reports that a male was in the area of
6		Hayfield Road in possession of a large knife."
7		And there was some preliminary information given to
8		you in that document:
9		Now, if we can move down the page, keep going. You
10		were then brought up to speed on the PIRC investigation.
11		You were given some information about the instructions
12		to PIRC, and some information about claims made by the
13		family regarding one of the officers and issues that had
14		been raised by them.
15		And if we can move down, there's then a heading
16		"Complaints about the Police". We don't need to look
17		through that.
18		Civil proceedings which have been raised in
19		August 2018, and that would be the month prior to this
20		briefing note, and the up coming specification of
21		documents, and then some information about those
22		proceedings and then if we can carry on, the conclusion.
23		So you're essentially being brought up to speed
24		about the incident itself, the PIRC investigation, and
25		the civil proceedings, and the conclusion is:

1 "The incident was referred by Police Scotland to the appropriate authorities timously on 3 May 2015 and since 2 3 then the force has supported the ongoing PIRC 4 investigation as necessary. Police Scotland are however 5 largely unsighted on the conclusions of PIRC and, as alluded to earlier, the contents of any reports 6 7 submitted to Crown Office." So this briefing note is dated, as we see from the 8 very top, September -- if we go back there -- September 9 10 2018 and we've heard that by this stage, in terms of the PIRC investigation, Crown Office was sent an interim 11 12 report, they were sent a final report in 2016 and then 13 there has been a Crown Office investigation, and all of 14 that has happened. 15 Now, we've heard evidence that at that stage, Police Scotland had never seen the PIRC report, either 16 17 the interim or the final; is that correct? To the best of my knowledge, yes, up to that point, yes. 18 Α. 19 So you did not have, as I understand it, the Q. 20 documentation from PIRC at that stage? 21 Α. No. 22 Thank you. And I wonder if we can just -- feel free to Q. if you would like to look at any section of this. 23 There's no reference here to any sort of assessment 24 having been carried out or -- by Professional Standards 25

1 or anything of that line -- along those lines. No comment there about any consideration of misconducting 2 3 proceedings or suspensions or anything along those 4 lines, nothing in the briefing note about that, but I'm 5 wondering what information were you given about the status of the officers, the status of proceedings under 6 7 the Regulations, that type of information? So I am going on memory here. I'm sure there would have 8 Α. 9 been a follow-up conversation with 10 Superintendent Blackhall and potentially other PSD colleagues. My recollection is that at that point --11 12 I am struggling here a little bit, counsel. You're 13 particularly projecting back to what happened in the 14 immediate aftermath, but my understanding was that there 15 were no disciplinary procedures in train at that point -- at that point in time. 16 All right. 17 Q. 18 But that is just -- that is my understanding. Α. 19 Thank you. So you've been told that there's no -- or Q. 20 you recall being told there was no disciplinary 21 proceedings extant at that time. Can we look, please, 22 at -- did you do anything about that at that stage? Did you intervene in any way at that stage or? 23 I would not have intervened at that stage, bearing in 24 Α. mind the PIRC would have carried out the investigation 25

6

7

18

19

20

21

22

- following the death of Mr Bayoh and, as you say, a

  number of reports had been submitted to Crown by that

  point. What I would have done at that point would have

  been to try to understand what the ongoing issues for

  Police Scotland still were.
  - Q. Can you help us understand what those ongoing issues were?
- So those I think would have come throughout the auspices 8 Α. 9 of -- there was a gold group I believe running at the 10 time, which I assumed chairpersonship of or chair of and those were looking at issues such as community cohesion 11 12 and the community impact of the death of Mr Bayoh both 13 of people in Fife and more widely, any ongoing legal 14 proceedings that there still were, the status of the 15 investigation, albeit that was with the PIRC, and, obviously, duty of care towards the subject officers as 16 17 well.
  - So I mean that's very broad and very high level obviously, but there was still a gold group structure in place in Police Scotland when I joined in 2018.
  - Q. Right. Could we go back to the Regulations, please, and look at Regulation 9, please, so that's SBPI 00633 and if we can look at Regulation 9, "Alleged Offences" 9.1:
- 24 "If the Deputy Chief Constable considers that it can 25 reasonably be inferred that a constable may have

1

2		Constable:
3		"(a) must refer the matter to the appropriate
4		prosecutor, and.
5		"(b) may spend or postpone any proceedings under
6		these Regulations until the appropriate prosecutor
7		intimates that:
8		"(1) criminal proceedings are not to be brought in
9		respect of any matter mentioned in the misconduct
10		allegation, or
11		"(2) any criminal proceedings which have been
12		brought have been concluded."
13		I would like to look at that with you, if I may.
14		If the Deputy Chief Constable considers it can
15		reasonably be inferred, who's carrying out that
16		assessment, that's the first step, whether it can be
17		reasonably inferred that a constable may have committed
18		a criminal offence?
19	Α.	So again, that would have been those initial
20		assessments would be made by colleagues in the PSD who
21		are trained and skilled and experienced in making those
22		assessments.
23	Q.	Okay. And do you know what standards or protocols they
24		were applying in carrying out that initial assessment?
25	Α.	So in terms of a criminal offence, then Scottish

committed a criminal offence, the Deputy Chief

- 1 criminal law would obviously be engaged, counsel. If 2 there was a report or an allegation that an officer had 3 broken the law, then that would be investigated in the 4 same way it would be investigated with or for any other 5 member of the public, police officers are certainly not above the law, so the investigation would be very 6 7 similar to that which would be carried out for any other person who may have broken or be alleged to have broken 8
- 10 Q. And do you remember seeing a report or any reports in connection with that assessment regarding the events of 12 3 May 2016?
- 13 I don't recall seeing any report. Α.

the same law.

9

11

16

17

18

19

20

- 14 Was it normal practice for a report to be prepared if Q. 15 that assessment was being done?
  - So again, I suppose the issue for me might be that if Α. such a report had been prepared, it would have probably been prepared some three years earlier, so it might not have been shared with myself in 2018 when circumstances had moved on, when the PIRC were engaged, when Crown was engaged and the like.
- I mean I have -- we have not got copies of reports that 22 Q. were prepared within the Inquiry and I wonder if you 23 know if these would exist, could we recover them? 24
- I don't know is the honest answer, I don't know. Again, 25 Α.

9

10

11

12

13

25

- 1 we can certainly, through Police Scotland's counsel 2 team, look at those issues, but I am not -- I have 3 got -- and again, forgive me, this is 2018, so it's 4 almost six years ago, I've got no recollection of seeing 5 any such report. I suppose I was being briefed on the circumstances as they stood in 2018 with that attempt on 6 7 the part of my colleagues to help me understand the events of May 2015. 8
  - Q. But in terms of your understanding of this Regulation, there would have been some sort of assessment carried out by PSD considering whether it could reasonably be inferred that a constable may have committed a criminal offence?
- So I think the aspect that I would certainly like to get 14 Α. 15 clarity on there for you, counsel, is given that the investigation was handed over to the PIRC, because of 16 17 the Article 2 obligations on Police Scotland to ensure 18 that it was a thorough external, independent 19 investigation into the circumstances of the death of 20 Mr Bayoh, it would not necessarily have been appropriate 21 for Police Scotland officers to try to, if you like, 22 jump the gun, if you like, in terms of coming to any determination on whether any criminality or any offences 23 had been carried out on the part of those officers. 24

My understanding is that that would have sat with

1		the PIRC for them to carry out their investigation and
2		then for the conclusions of that investigation to lead
3		to assessments of potentially criminal conduct on the
4		part of the officer or officers.
5	Q.	Right. So in terms of these regulations, that make no
6		reference to PIRC, it says:
7		"If the DCC considers that it can reasonably be
8		inferred that a constable may have committed an
9		offence"
10		Then certain things follow on from that. There
11		appears to be an expectation in terms of Regulation 9
12		that the DCC will carry out consideration of that
13		question.
14		Is it your understanding that as soon as PIRC had
15		instructed to carry out a crown-led investigation that
16		that means this obligation under Regulation 9 doesn't
17		apply?
18	Α.	So I would under normal circumstances, if the PIRC
19		had carried out an investigation, then there would be
20		follow-on conversation with Police Scotland at that a
21		point in time where the investigation was concluded.
22		That again would generally be through the
23		ACC Professionalism delegated rather than myself, but an
24		event of such sort of gravity clearly as the case of
25		Mr Bayoh was, I don't know I don't know what

- conversation went on between Police Scotland and the PIRC in 2015. What again I can say is in sort of 2023, when I handed over the Professionalism Portfolio, the day-to-day interactions, the communication, the understanding, the just basically the relationship between Police Scotland and the PIRC was very good, so there was ongoing kind of conversations, consultation and the like. I can't speak to what that might have been like in 2015.
  - Q. But in terms of your understanding of the position when you were in the role, if there's a PIRC investigation in relation to any matter regarding conduct, is it your understanding that this is interpreted by police as everything stops under these regulations, nothing is done until the PIRC investigation is concluded?
  - A. So again, that's not necessarily the case and I won't go into the detail of it, but I can think of one investigation that was carried on in the last sort of couple of years of my service with Police Scotland where actually we worked collaboratively with the PIRC. In other words, we supported them with some of the activity that they had to carry on in respect of it particular investigation that they were taking forward. So again, I think it's a question of looking at every set of circumstances on its merits.

1 In that particular set of circumstances, again, I 2 won't go into the detail of it, certainly the 3 determination was made very early on by Police Scotland that the individual officer involved should be 4 5 suspended. So, no, it's not the case that 6 Police Scotland always take a step back. As I say, 7 certainly in my tenure, there was much more -- there was a great deal of kind of communication and interaction 8 between ourselves and the PIRC. 9 10 Q. When you were in the role, the example you're talking about where you worked collaboratively with PIRC, would 11 12 you say that was a successful collaboration with PIRC? 13 Yes, I think it was. I mean they carried out the Α. 14 investigation, they have their own terms of reference, 15 they have their own statutory remit, but we supported elements, some of the operational elements, of that 16 investigation to enable them to reach a conclusion. 17 18 And that was did you say 2023? Q. 19 So that would have been around about probably 2022, Α. 20 counsel. 21 Q. Thank you. The officer was suspended, so misconduct 22 proceedings in terms of the Regulations were initiated by Police Scotland? 23 Initiated under those very particular circumstances, 24 Α. because of the information which was available to us at 25

1 the time, but then pended -- pended. What I'm trying to say is the misconduct was pended because the criminal 2 3 investigation was ongoing. Sorry that was a clumsy way 4 of putting it. 5 The misconduct procedures under the Regulations were Q. 6 initiated, the officer was suspended? 7 Α. Yes. And the PIRC investigation carried on and 8 Q. 9 Police Scotland worked collaboratively? 10 Α. Yes. Was that the first time in your experience that you had 11 Q. 12 had that collaborative working with PIRC? 13 Not the first time, no, but that was I think a Α. 14 particularly good example of the two organisations 15 working within their clearly defined professional areas of responsibilities, but with that sort of common 16 determination to keep the public safe. 17 When was the first time you became aware of this 18 Q. 19 collaborative working with PIRC? What was your first 20 experience of that? 21 Α. So I think -- I mean there had always been -- there had 22 always been communication at the kind of more senior levels between Police Scotland and the PIRC, but I think 23 it was largely as a consequence -- and I have to give 24

ACC Spiers a lot of credit here. ACC Spiers ensured

1 that his team and the PIRC team were talking regularly, understand each other's terms of reference and each 2 3 other's remit and, predominantly, we would never step 4 into the PIRC's space unless they invited us to support 5 them. So again, it would be a question of, well, is it appropriate, should Police Scotland just hands off and 6 7 this is entirely in the gift of the PIRC or are there some operational activity that we can carry out that 8 9 will support the PIRC that can be absolutely quality 10 assured in terms of its professionalism, should that be required. 11 12 But each, if you like, individual set of 13 circumstances was quite different, but what I can say, 14 counsel, is that over the course of my tenure in 15 Police Scotland the working relationship between Police Scotland and the PIRC went from strength to 16 17 strength and I never felt that the PIRC had concerns 18 about asking for support if they felt that was the appropriate thing to do and Police Scotland could 19 20 support them. 21 You started the role in 2018. What was your first Q. 22 experience of working collaboratively with PIRC that you're aware of? 23 24 Α. So again going -- I would speak to the -- and this is 25 on, I guess, a personal rather than an obligation basis,

25

Q.

1 I would speak to the then Commissioner on a I think it was on a quarterly basis, so we would speak regularly 2 3 and of course if anything untoward happened, then we 4 would speak more regularly than that. I think it is 5 fair to say that that relationship improved yet further with the current Commissioner again and I remember the 6 7 events of West George Street when Police Scotland officers discharged their firearms and I can remember 8 9 speaking to the PIRC at a very early stage in respect of 10 that particular incident back in I think that might have been 2020, or 2021, it was certainly during the Covid 11 12 pandemic. So that working relationship, as I say, has 13 improved, it has developed, it has enhanced and I think 14 that is largely because of that sort of shared 15 experience and understanding we have had. What I would say though is that the current PIRC and 16 17 indeed her predecessor are very, very clear on the lines of responsibility and those professional red lines, you 18 19 know, that we don't cross, their investigation is their 20 investigation. 21 Q. When you came into the role in 2018, was that collaborative working relationship in place, up and 22 running, at that stage? 23 I think it was a different relationship at that point. 24 Α.

Describe the relationship at that point?

- 1 Α. So I was getting to  $\operatorname{--}$  I came from an environment where the Department of Professional Standards in the Met was 2 3 working on a regular basis with the IPCC, as it was 4 then, the Independent Police Complaints Commission, 5 obviously it's changed its name now, and there was a specific relationship that I had in the Met with the 6 7 IPCC. So it took me a little while time, counsel, just to 8 understand what the roles and responsibilities of the 9 10 PIRC were in Police Scotland and how Police Scotland interacted within the PIRC in this jurisdiction, in this 11 12 environment. What I didn't want to do was to make any 13 pronunciations based on the relationship I had with 14 senior members of the IPCC in London. So I think it's 15 fair to say it took me a little while to get up to speed on the relationship that we had organisationally with 16 the PIRC as an entity. 17
- 18 Q. Is it fair to say that when you first came into the 19 role, the working relationship with PIRC was different?
- 20 A. It was different.
- 21 Q. But it has evolved since then --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- into a much more collaborative working relationship?
- A. Into certainly what I would describe now as a properly collaborative working relationship.

- 1 Q. But that wasn't the relationship that existed in 2018?
- 2 A. It was a different relationship in 2018.
- 3 Q. Right. And so in terms of the Regulations, to come back
- 4 to those, when you first arrived in the role, is it fair
- 5 to say that if PIRC were involved at that stage, no
- 6 matters were initiated in relation to the misconduct
- 7 regulations, conduct regulations?
- 8 A. So I can't recall -- and again, just thinking back to
- 9 notwithstanding the circumstances surrounding Mr Bayoh's
- 10 death any incidents and I can't recall any incidents or
- events in 2018 that I could use to better explore your
- 12 question, counsel, but I certainly don't recall there
- being any incidents which were investigated by the PIRC
- 14 where we were making -- but I can't recall. That's not
- to say it didn't happen.
- Q. Right. But from your memory at least, it would appear
- 17 that in 2018 if PIRC were involved carrying out an
- investigation, Police Scotland did not carry out an
- assessment in terms of the conduct regulations?
- 20 A. Unless there was -- and again, and just reflecting on
- 21 the circumstances in 2022, had it been very clear to us
- 22 that, for arguments sake, there was incontrovertible
- 23 evidence that an officer had misconducted themselves or
- 24 appeared to be incontrovertible evidence or there was a
- 25 need to protect the investigation from a PIRC

- 1 perspective, there may have been a determination made to
- 2 restrict or suspend an officer, so that may still have
- 3 gone ahead.
- Q. Right. But we know in relation to Mr Bayoh's death that
- 5 PIRC were involved on 3 May 2015?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. On the day he died and commenced an investigation at
- 8 that stage. We've heard a lot of evidence about that
- 9 investigation. Is it possible that PIRC being involved
- from that day and that existence of that PIRC
- investigation meant that in fact there won't be reports
- 12 available regarding an assessment under Regulation 9,
- because matters were left until the PIRC investigation
- 14 was concluded?
- 15 A. That's possible, but I genuinely don't know.
- Q. Okay. We'll have to check that.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Thank you. Let's move on to the second stage. Looking
- 19 at this assessment as it's set out in the Regulations,
- 20 Regulation 9, that the DCC considers it can reasonably
- 21 be inferred that a constable may have committed a
- criminal offence, I'm interested in how that assessment,
- that consideration is given. Presumably you're not
- looking at it on the standard of beyond reasonable
- doubt, but how would that assessment be carried out?

11

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 Α. So, counsel, I do, you know, I do understand the limits of my professional competence in this area and because I 2 3 haven't conducted these assessments myself, I would ask 4 that that is a question which is probably better put to 5 the ACC Professionalism or indeed to a colleague in the Professional Standards Department who deals with these 6 7 assessments on a day-in, day-out basis and should be able to describe to you exactly how they would take 8 place. 9
- 10 Q. Thank you. In relation to this assessment then, you may not be in a position to help me with this, I'm 12 interested in the sort of practice that's adopted, whether Police Scotland ever ask for statements from 13 PIRC. Perhaps you can use the 2022 example you have 15 been talking about to enlighten us about the procedure that's now followed. 16
  - So I think -- so again, just understanding, you know, Α. the limits of my professional competence, I think there are others who can talk you through that assessment process. I may see the ultimate outcome from it, but I wouldn't carry it out myself and, again, I think the incident in 2022 may well have been a referral from Police Scotland to the PIRC. So we were made aware of the initial set of circumstances, we acted to secure and preserve evidence to ensure we kept the public safe in

1 the first instance and then understanding the 2 circumstances, we referred the matter to the PIRC, so 3 slightly different perhaps. We have heard evidence that PIRC can become involved 4 Q. 5 either with a crown-led investigation? 6 Yes. Α. 7 Q. Which is the situation that occurred here, and that we're looking at here in relation to the death of 8 9 Mr Bayoh, or they can have a CC, a Chief 10 Constable-directed investigation. Now, as I understand it, where it's a Chief 11 12 Constable directed one, Police Scotland are still 13 continuing with their investigations, still proceeding 14 in charge of matters, but with a crown-led one it's the 15 crown that take responsibility for that? 16 Α. Yes. So in the one that you're talking about, that was a 17 Q. Chief Constable-directed investigation and that's how 18 19 PIRC got involved? 20 That's my recollection. Again, there may have been Α. 21 crown direction in there as a circumstance -- whoops --22 as the circumstances started to evolve, but I think it was Chief Constable related. It was a relatively 23 complex set of circumstances, as I am sure you can 24 imagine. 25

- Q. Even in 2022 then or 2023, before you left, if it was a crown-led investigation, did that mean Police Scotland stepped back completely not just from the investigation, which they hand over to PIRC, but also in relation to conduct regulation matters?
  - A. Not necessarily. There may have been that assessment carried out and that assessment may have led to an individual being, as I say, suspended from duty or potentially put on to restricted duties.
  - Q. And in terms of the collaborative working relationship that you described earlier, would that involve sharing information and material between PIRC and Police Scotland, even if it was a crown-led investigation or became a crown-led investigation?
    - A. I genuinely don't know the answer to that. I am very conscious that, you know, if PIRC asked

      Police Scotland -- we would provide anything to PIRC that they required of us, whether it was crown directed or we had referred or the Chief Constable had referred to PIRC. If PIRC tasked us to, for arguments sake, go and carry out a house search, then that material would be obviously then also provided back to PIRC, but I, you know, I need to be really clear about the, you know, professional boundaries between PIRC and ourselves, counsel, and the proper regard they took to the

1		integrity of any investigation that they carried
2		forward.
3	Q.	Right. Looking back at Regulation 9, so we've looked at
4		the consideration of whether it can reasonably be
5		inferred and:
6		"The Deputy Chief Constable (a) must refer the
7		matter to the appropriate prosecutor."
8		That would be the crown more likely than not?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And:
11		"(b) may suspend or postpone any proceedings under
12		these regulations until the appropriate prosecutor
13		intimates:
14		"(1) the criminal proceedings are not to be brought
15		in respect of any matter mentioned, or
16		"(2) any criminal proceedings which have been
17		brought have been concluded."
18		So once the assessment has been carried out, the
19		Chief Constable, if he or she considers the constable
20		may have committed a reasonable offence or that can be
21		reasonable inferred, must refer it to the prosecutor and
22		may suspend or postpone any proceedings under these
23		regulations. So it's not compulsory to postpone
24		proceedings under the conduct regulations, but that may
25		be done?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	And so in terms of a decision and making a decision
3		about whether or not to suspend or postpone proceedings
4		under the conduct regulations, whose responsible for
5		doing that?
6	A.	So again that would that would predominantly be
7		throughout the ACC Professionalism and the Department
8		for Professional Standards and I think it's right to
9		say, counsel, that custom and practice would generally
10		be within Police Scotland if there is a criminal
11		investigation ongoing that takes priority over any
12		misconduct proceedings, because the last thing that we
13		would want to do would be in any way to prejudice those
14		conduct sorry, those criminal proceedings.
15	Q.	We'll come on to that in a moment. So there is a
16		decision which has to be made because the DCC:
17		"Although you must refer the matter to the
18		prosecutor, you may suspend or postpone proceedings
19		under the conduct regulations."
20		So a decision will have to be made about whether or
21		not to suspend or postpone proceedings under the
22		Regulations, and who would be responsible for that?
23	A.	Again, that would sit given that that's a further
24		delegation of those responsibilities to the
25		ACC Professionalism, that would sit with the

- 1 ACC Professionalism and their senior team generally.
- 2 Q. And is that discussed with you at one of your daily
- discussions with --
- 4 A. It would, yes, in terms of an individual officer has --
- 5 now, whether this has gone to the PIRC or this has been
- 6 investigated by Police Scotland, a file has gone to
- 7 crown, the officer is suspended or restricted and
- 8 conduct will follow any outcome from crown.
- 9 Q. And are you asked to approve those decisions?
- 10 A. No, if there was anything which was particularly
- 11 contentious, then Alan would come and discuss it with
- me, but, no, on an ongoing basis, and again this is
- largely to do with the volume of activity that PSD is
- 14 engaged with and also the range of activity that was my
- 15 responsibility within Police Scotland, that was why we
- 16 had those levels of delegation and designation.
- Q. But with a very serious matter, would you expect that to
- be discussed with the DCC?
- 19 A. I would expect to have the conversation, yes, but if it
- 20 was a very serious matter, counsel, my take would be
- 21 almost invariably we need to put the -- we need to put
- 22 the crown investigation and any criminal proceedings
- 23 first. And that can -- that can result in officers
- 24 being suspended for a considerable period of time while
- a file goes through the crown process.

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. They may suspend or postpone these proceedings under the
  Regulations until the prosecutor intimates criminal
  proceedings are not to be brought or they have been
  concluded. What is the position if the prosecutor says
  we're not bringing proceedings at the moment but that
  may change in the future? What impact does that have on
  these Regulations?
- So again, it's difficult to generalise, but my take 8 Α. 9 would be and, again, the current ACC Professionalism or 10 now DCC Spiers I'm sure would give you a much more articulate overview of this, but my take at the moment 11 12 is if crown decides not to proceed for the time being, 13 then the conduct process would begin. It can be halted 14 at any point. The conduct process could be halted at 15 any point, but if crown takes the decision not to proceed, then the likelihood is that -- again, it's --16 17 it's difficult to be utterly definitive, but the conduct process is -- if circumstances were -- demanded a 18 19 conduct process then it sits there.
  - Q. So if the prosecutor says we're not bringing proceedings, it would be open to Police Scotland at that stage to proceed with any matters under the Regulations?
  - A. It would certainly be open to Police Scotland to consider whether there are conduct allegations which could be taken forward.

1 Q. Even if that had not been done previously, at the point 2 at which the prosecutor has said there will be no 3 prosecution, it was then open -- there's nothing to stop 4 Police Scotland from considering it at that point? 5 That's right. Α. And a decision can be made at that point? 6 Q. 7 Α. It could be potentially, yes. Under the Regulations? 8 Q. 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. And then if we look at the next step, if we could look at -- I think we have not looked at 2: 11 12 "If proceedings are suspended or postponed under 13 paragraph 1(b), the DCC must inform the constable that 14 these proceedings have been suspended or postponed." 15 So there has to be some sort of formal intimation to the constable --16 Yes. 17 Α. 18 Q. -- that there has been a suspension or postponement. 19 "And those proceedings or any other proceedings may 20 be taken against the constable whether or not criminal 21 proceedings are brought, regardless of the outcome of those." 22 23 And then it says who the prosecutor is. We don't need to look at that. 24 25 So there will at some point, if there is a decision

1 taken to spend or postpone proceedings under these 2 Regulations there must be something sent to the 3 constable, some intimation to the constable involved, so 4 they know what's happening really? 5 Α. Yes. 6 That will be part of what I think you said earlier about Q. 7 thinking about welfare and --That is exactly right, and certainly, again, in my time 8 Α. 9 in Police Scotland, the welfare wraparound for 10 Constables under -- or indeed any rank under investigation was significantly enhanced, counsel, given 11 12 our duty of care for those individuals as, you know, regardless of any conduct or criminal proceedings that 13 14 they may have been involved in. 15 Q. Thank you. I would like to move on to Craig Blackhall's statement now, SBPI 00601 and he was the superintendent. 16 17 We've seen his name on the briefing paper. He was the superintendent for Professional Standards Department 18 from 2015 to 2019. 19 20 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame, it's now half past, so perhaps 21 we'll take a 20 minute break before you embark on this. 22 (11.30 am)23 (A short break) 24 (11.30 am)25 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.

1 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. We were just about to move on to 2 Craig Blackhall's statement, which we'll bring up on the 3 screen, SBPI 0601. 4 Now, Craig Blackhall, as I understand it, was the 5 Superintendent for the Professional Standards Department and that was from February 2014 to 2019. And I think we 6 7 looked at the briefing paper that he prepared for you in 2018 --8 Yes. 9 Α. 10 Q. -- in relation to Mr Bayoh. I would like to look at two of the paragraphs in his statement, 42, first of all, 11 12 and then 44. So this is the Inquiry statement he has 13 given to the Inquiry and it's signed: 14 "I'm asked who's responsible for deciding whether to 15 discipline or raise misconduct proceedings in relation to the officers who engaged with Sheku Bayoh. 16 17 Ultimately, the Deputy Chief Constable who had oversight of Professional Standards would be responsible. I think 18 at the time this was Mr Neil Richardson." 19 20 So is that likely to be correct then? 21 Α. I think so, to the best of my recollection. 22 Yes. So you've no reason to disagree. Superintendent Q. Blackhall was the superintendent in charge of the 23 Professional Standards Department in 2015? 24 And he was in the organisation in 2015. 25

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Q. He was. He was in that particular department from February 2014, but he had been a police officer for many 2 3 years prior to that so he's likely to be correct. 4 Α. Yes. 5 And when he says who's responsible for deciding whether Q. to discipline or raise misconduct proceedings in 6 7 relation to the officers who engaged with Sheku Bayoh, he said, ultimately, Mr Richardson would be responsible; 8 would you agree with that? 9 10 Α. Yes. Thank you. And then paragraph 44, if we could have that 11 Q. 12 on the screen: 13 "In this case I wasn't involved, but the PIRC 14 investigation would take primacy. The assessment of any 15 possible misconduct wouldn't have been considered until the outcome of the investigation because Police Scotland 16 17 wasn't conducting the investigation."

And I'm interested in that, because it appears to say on the face of it that when PIRC became involved, their investigation would take primacy and there would be no assessment, it wouldn't have been considered, until the outcome of that PIRC investigation, because Police Scotland weren't conducting the investigation. Is that your understanding of that procedure at that time?

- 1 A. My understanding of the procedure at that time is
- 2 difficult for me to speak to, counsel, because I wasn't
- 3 in the organisation at that time so difficult for me to
- 4 comment on that paragraph.
- 5 Q. All right. But certainly on the face of it it does look
- 6 like Superintendent Blackhall, who's in charge of PSD,
- 7 is saying an assessment of any possible misconduct
- 8 wouldn't have been considered until the outcome of what
- 9 was the PIRC investigation.
- 10 A. That's -- yes.
- 11 Q. Was that the -- did that remain the position in 2018
- when you came into the department and took charge of the
- 13 portfolio?
- 14 A. I think that was still the case.
- 15 Q. That was?
- 16 A. I believe so, yes.
- Q. Although the Regulations exist, if there was a PIRC
- investigation, they would not be considered. The
- 19 Regulations and an assessment under the Regulations
- 20 about misconduct would not have been considered until
- 21 the outcome of the PIRC investigation.
- 22 A. Particularly if that was a criminal investigation.
- 23 Q. So if there was a criminal investigation being conducted
- by PIRC, there would be no assessment of possible
- 25 misconduct under the regulations?

1 Α. Until the conclusion of the investigation. Right. Thank you. Can we go back to Regulation 9. 2 Q. 3 Thank you. We were look at this just before the break. 4 Now, it says here: "If the Deputy Chief Constable considers it can 5 reasonably be inferred that a constable may have 6 committed a criminal offence ... must refer the matter 7 to the prosecutor, may suspend or postpone any 8 9 proceedings under these Regulations until criminal 10 proceedings are not to be brought or they have been concluded." 11 12 It would appear from Regulation 9 that there is to 13 be some sort of assessment to consider by the Deputy 14 Chief Constable if it can reasonably be inferred that a 15 Police Constable may have committed a criminal offence. Now, I have gone through these Regulations, there's 16 17 no mention, as far as I can find, I'll be corrected if I'm wrong, of PIRC. PIRC did exist at this time, but 18 they're not mentioned. There's no mention of an FAI. 19 20 Hm-hmm. Α. 21 This is about criminal proceedings, FAI's, fatal Q. 22 accident inquiries, are not criminal proceedings. There's no mention of victim's right of reviews or any 23 of that type of procedure that we've heard something of 24 in relation to the crown. 25

1 So the Regulations do not say Police Scotland should not consider whether misconduct -- whether it can be 2 reasonably inferred that a criminal offence has been 3 4 committed. So I'm interested in your assessment of the 5 situation here, because on the one hand the Regulations do not say, don't carry out an assessment under these 6 7 regulations if PIRC are doing an investigation, but that seems, certainly according to that Superintendent 8 9 Blackhall's statement, that that is what was being done, 10 that was the impact really of a PIRC investigation. Can you explain why the Regulations, even when you 11 12 were there, were being interpreted in that way, that as 13 soon as there was a PIRC investigation, no assessment 14 was being done? 15 A. My understanding of those circumstances was that the 16 PIRC investigation would take primacy. The PIRC 17 investigation would continue -- would take place, would 18 ultimately result, and depending on the outcome from 19 that PIRC investigation, there could then be an 20 assessment carried out. 21 Now, as I say, that wouldn't stop us if there was 22 any immediate concern for a public safety or for the integrity of that PIRC investigation for whatever reason 23 from taking a decision to restrict or suspend an 24 officer, but the misconduct assessment wouldn't have 25

19

20

21

22

23

24

- been carried out at that stage to the best of my
  recollection.
- Q. And in the absence of a specific provision within the
  Regulations that Police Scotland should not consider
  misconduct, can you explain why it was being done in
  that way?
- 7 So in terms of -- from my perspective, I think there is Α. a logic to that, and there is also an element of custom 8 9 and practice. The logic being that if PIRC have been 10 asked to investigate, then the circumstances are going to be quite serious or severe. Therefore, if you like 11 12 the preeminence of the PIRC investigation is clear, it's 13 right that they should have a clear field to carry on 14 that investigation. And equally, if Police Scotland --15 what I would never have wanted to see was that any determination around misconduct at an early stage might 16 17 have interfered with or undermined the PIRC 18 investigation.
  - Q. Right. The standards of behaviour that we looked at before, we talked about Constables must behave in a manner which does not secret the police service or undermine public confidence in it. We can put the schedule back on the screen if that helps. I think you accepted that that was one of the standards of behaviour that officers are held to account in terms of those?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	And they have got to undermine public confidence.
3		What steps were being taken then in relation to
4		we've heard evidence about considerable public concerns
5		about the death of Mr Bayoh and in terms of not just the
6		public's concerns, the family had considerable concerns.
7		So what steps were being taken when you were in the role
8		about dealing with those public concerns which continued
9		during your tenure?
10	Α.	So those concerns were picked up on a regular basis
11		through the gold group which I chaired, where local
12		senior managers in Fife Division and indeed from our
13		Safer Communities Team would be updating themselves and
14		updating myself on public sentiment. If there are areas
15		of concern or consideration, which as you say, counsel,
16		there were, then there were mechanisms for local
17		divisional commanders to meet with concerned parties,
18		whether that was, you know, potentially members of
19		Mr Bayoh's extended family, potentially, or their
20		representatives or indeed community leaders.
21		So there were a number of options and opportunities,
22		both divisionally and indeed centrally, for
23		Police Scotland to work to understand where those
24		community concerns lay and to do our best to ensure that
25		the local policing response was sensitive to and

- 1 addressed those concerns.
- 2 Q. Right. But in terms of opportunities available to
- 3 Police Scotland to deal with public concerns, none were
- 4 being taken in terms of the Regulation or throughout
- 5 prison of the Regulations at that time?
- 6 A. Predominantly through community impact and community
- 7 cohesion, certainly in my time when I joined in 2018.
- 8 Q. That was the route that Police Scotland took. They did
- 9 not go throughout prison of the Regulations?
- 10 A. I can only speak for the period that I was in
- 11 Police Scotland.
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13 A. And certainly the gold group which I chaired at the time
- 14 was very sensitive to community concerns, ongoing
- 15 community concerns from 2015.
- 16 Q. But in terms of the standards that are set out in
- 17 Schedule 1 of the Regulations that Constables behave in
- a manner that does not discredit the police service or
- 19 undermine public confidence in it, there was no
- 20 consideration given at that stage when you were in the
- 21 role about dealing with matters through regulations. It
- 22 was dealt with through alternative routes.
- 23 A. It was dealt with in alternative routes and the
- 24 rationale for that clearly was that there had been a
- 25 significant inquiry ongoing, still ongoing in certain

elements, into the death of Mr Bayoh. That obviously
would lead in time to a public Inquiry. If not a public
Inquiry, then we anticipated that there would be a Fatal
Accident Inquiry. The magnitude of the incident would
demand one of the other.

So again, you know, from not wanting to undermine any ongoing process we did use alternative mechanisms at that point in time, counsel, rather than going back some years later to the standards of behaviour at that point in time, as I say, knowing there were other processes in train.

- Q. So you didn't want to undermine the ongoing process.

  What assessment did you carry out in relation to the extent to which the process PIRC were carrying out -
  the investigation PIRC were carrying out? To what extent that could or would or perhaps be determined, was there an assessment carried out about whether any steps taken under the Regulations would undermine or would
- A. So there was no investigation carried out by myself. As I say, I go back to my -- and no doubt I would have received advice on this at the time that actually we need to allow those hierarchically preeminent processes to work through in the first instance.

potentially undermine the PIRC investigation?

Q. Right. So nothing specific about whether the

- proceedings under the Regulations would undermine the
  PIRC investigation at that stage?
- 3 A. Not carried out by myself, no.
- Q. No. Was there any consideration given to whether

  proceedings under the Regulations would undermine the

  role of the crown or possible potential criminal

  proceedings?
- So again, as I said earlier, our take in Police Scotland 8 Α. 9 has always been that criminal proceedings take precedence and take priority. Because of the issues 10 around conduct with different standards of proof, there 11 12 is a possibility that a conduct investigation will reach 13 a particular outcome, you know. That may 14 inadvertently -- that may inadvertently influence or 15 sway any further criminal proceedings, which, as I say, clearly are preeminent in terms of any order of 16 17 hierarchy, so we would allow criminal proceedings in the vast majority of cases to conclude. Under the current 18 19 regulatory system, we would allow the criminal to work 20 through and conclude the determination being made about 21 whether the proceedings were going to follow before 22 embarking on any misconduct assessment.
- Q. And you say that's the vast majority of cases. If
  there's criminal proceedings pending or possible, you
  would not proceed with conduct under --

25

1 Α. Yes. 2 So where Regulation 9(b) says "the DCC may suspend or Q. 3 postpone proceedings", you interpret that as, the DCC 4 shall suspend or postpone proceedings and that's in the 5 vast majority of cases? So I think, yes, can suspend, you know, and did in the 6 Α. 7 vast majority of cases, but then, you know, there would be a conversation around the best and most appropriate 8 9 course of action if anything was sufficient sort of 10 gravity and significance, counsel. So anything that is of sufficient gravity to involve the 11 Q. 12 PIRC or involve the crown would be taken out of -- would 13 effectively mean in practice that Regulation 9(b) means 14 any proceedings will be suspended? 15 It would come out of the conduct space in the interim, Α. 16 yes. Come out of the conduct space. Can I ask you to look at 17 Q. another document, PS11500. This is a memo. So this is 18 a memo that we've heard evidence about dated 19 20 1 April 2013 and that's the date that Police Scotland 21 came into existence, it's the date that PIRC came into 22 existence, and it's headed, "Police Investigations and Review Commissioner. Operational discharge of CS 23 incapacitant spray." 24

From 1 April 2013, there is a legal requirement for

the Police Service of Scotland and PIRC to ensure 1 2 compliance with the provisions of the Police Public 3 Order and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act, as amended by 4 the 2012 Act that you've mentioned and the Human Rights 5 Act and Articles 2 and 3 of the European Convention On Human Rights, so this is a legal requirement on 6 7 Police Scotland and it's to ensure compliance, it's not to take reasonable steps, it's to ensure, and then it 8 9 goes on to say: 10 "This means that on every occasion where CS incapacitant spray is discharged operationally there is 11 12 a legal requirement to record the incident and report onwards to PIRC within 24 hours." 13 14 And then it mentions the form that has to be 15 completed. We have heard evidence that CS spray is dealt with as if it was a firearm and so it's treated 16 17 very seriously and there's a legal requirement that notification be sent to PIRC about this. And a form was 18 provided for and that's to be done within 24 hours. 19 20 Now, we have heard evidence that spray was used at 21 Hayfield Road and we have heard evidence that forms were not completed for the use of play and a number of 22 23 witnesses have spoken about that. Is a failure to comply with the legal requirement a failure to comply 24 with the law contrary to the standards of professional 25

behaviour? 1 2 Very likely to be, yes. Α. 3 Well, very likely or can a police officer break the law Q. 4 and not breach the standards of professional behaviour? 5 So if somebody were to exceed the speed limit in terms Α. of a pursuit, then, technically, they are breaking the 6 7 law, but actually that pursuit will have been authorised through the control room, so in those circumstances, no, 8 9 they are not. 10 What I would argue here though is if we have a force 11 memo and, again, this is a force memo from 2013, if it 12 says explicitly, then you should do this, then from my 13 perspective, unless they have a very compelling 14 rationale not to or are given particular advice that 15 they shouldn't for whatever reason, counsel, then the presumption is that, yes, they should. 16 17 Okay. In relation to the failure to complete these Q. 18 forms that is something that would have been known by 19 Police Scotland an early stage within 24 hours. Can you 20 help us understand why -- and I'm using this as an 21 example. Can you help us understand why no steps were 22 taken to address this issue within the Regulations? So I think that is possibly a question which is better 23 Α. posed to somebody who was in service in 2015 when the 24 events occurred at Hayfield Road and, as you say, the 25

1 follow-up events in terms of post-incident took place. It's very difficult for me, retrospectively, to help you 2 3 to understand why those forms were or were not filled 4 in. 5 What I would say is the post-incident procedures that pertain to Police Scotland have evolved 6 7 significantly in the intervening number of years, not least because there was a recommendations within 8 9 Dame Elish Angiolini's Report, but also because the 10 post-incident procedures were being refreshed and updated in any event, but difficult for me to put myself 11 12 back in the situation in Police Scotland in 2015 and 13 give you a compelling answer to that question, counsel. Right. If it had happened during your tenure that 14 Q. 15 officers failed to comply with a legal requirement, what steps would you have required to be done? 16 So as in any set of circumstances, there would have been 17 Α. colleagues within -- as we've discussed previously, 18 19 there would have been colleagues within PSD, including 20 up to the ACC, dealing with any of those circumstances, 21 but I would have wanted to understand why, if there was 22 a stipulation that a police officer should do a particular thing and do that thing within a particular 23 timescale, if that timescale had been breached, I would 24 want to understand why that was the case. 25

1 Again, to give you an example of that, if an officer had been injured perhaps in the course of an event or 2 3 series of events after having discharged their CS spray 4 and were not back at work for a number of days there may 5 be mitigating circumstances there. Equally, one could argue, well, why didn't your sergeant or your supervisor 6 7 or what have you complete those forming on your behalf. Generally, yes, I would want to know why if a force 8 9 memo which was active within the organisation hadn't 10 been adhered to, particularly, as you say, with personal protective equipment such as CS, I would certainly want 11 12 to understand why that hadn't been complied with. 13 If this had happened when you were in post, is that the Q. 14 type of thing you would have wanted to be investigated 15 by Police Scotland? I would certainly have wanted to understand why that 16 Α. didn't happen. 17 18 Yes. And from what you're saying, would you then have Q. 19 wanted an assessment to be carried out as to the 20 circumstances as to why it didn't happen? 21 Α. I think that's a -- you know, given as I have just 22 described there may have been extenuating circumstances then, yes, I think an assessment would be appropriate. 23 Q. So is the situation that where an officer has failed to 24 25 comply with a legal requirement that the circumstances

- 1 can be taken account of and no proceedings could be initiated under the Regulations? 2
- That's possible, yes, that's absolutely possible. As I 3 Α. 4 say, it's important to take every set of circumstances 5 on their merits. In some cases there may be extenuating circumstances and in others there may not.
- 7 Right. We've heard evidence that after the death of Q. Mr Bayoh forms were not completed and, ultimately, 8 9 statements were not given until the 4 June 2015. You'll 10 be aware of that. And we've taken a lot of evidence from various witnesses in PIRC and other witnesses about 11 12 what could have helped to try and encourage officers to 13 giving statements during that period of just over a 14 month. Was any consideration, as far as you know, and 15 you may not, being given to whether the Regulations could be used to assist the PIRC investigation and get 16
- Statements or forms? 18 Α.

forms from the officers?

- 19 Sorry. The forms that we're talking about here with the Q. 20 incapacitant spray. The statements were ultimately 21 given on 4 June.
- 22 Right. Α.

6

17

But in the period between 3 May 2015, and 4 June 2015, 23 Q. 24 there were no statements, no initial accounts, no basic facts, no operational statements, no witness statements, 25

1 no use of force forms and no use of spray forms. But in relation to the use of spray forms, there was a legal 2 3 requirement for completion and we have spoken to a lot 4 of witnesses about what things could have perhaps been 5 done to make the situation better and I'm interested in your perspective about whether the Regulations and the 6 7 apparent lack of compliance with this legal requirement could have been used to try and assist the PIRC 8 9 investigation during that time, because the evidence 10 from PIRC, if I can summaries it this way is, they didn't have statements from the people who were 11 12 effectively eye witness? 13 Yes. It's a very, very pertinent point and there are Α. 14 two issues there, counsel, if I may. The first goes 15 back to the issue of post-incident procedures and, particularly, post-incident procedures in non-firearms 16 17 incidents, because I think you will no doubt have heard 18 evidence that back in 2015 post-incident procedures were 19 largely applied to firearms incidents where firearms --20 what you or I would conventionally describe as a 21 firearm, as in a carbine or a pistol. 22 So there were post-incident procedures for firearms, not so much for circumstances such as tragedy of a death 23 in police custody or a death following police contact. 24 So there has been an awful lot of work done in the 25

1 intervening years around ensuring that those post-incident processes are now fit for purpose and the 2 3 officers understand the periods of time where the 4 different statements should be provided to the PIRC to 5 support and those operating statements -- again, I might 6 be getting my terminology slightly wrong, it might have 7 moved on in my absence -- but those operational statements can be provided to the PIRC or the 8 investigators at very early stage to your point to help 9 10 them to understand the set-up of the incident, who was where, who said did what, very high level, but then 11 12 enables them to continue their investigation up until 13 the point in time where they get a more full witness 14 statement with all of the proper safeguard around that. 15 So there's certainly something about post-incident having improved in the intervening seven -- nine years 16 17 now, isn't it, seven years since the -- seven years since the public Inquiry I believe, I believe started. 18 So post-incident procedures have improved in the 19 meantime. In terms of --20 21 I think you have got your dates wrong there, but we Q. 22 won't worry about that. A. Certainly 2015 to 2024 a lot has changed in terms of the 23 post-incident and support for subject officers through 24 25 that period, and a lot of learning from earlier events.

- In terms of use of regulations to provide for the
  use of force forms, again, that's always -- that's a
  possibility. Difficult for me to say because I wasn't
  there whether that was a consideration that the senior
  officers at the time actually had.
  - Q. Can you think of any reason, from when you were in your role, why Police Scotland could not make a request to officers or instruct officers to complete these forms if the 24-hour deadline is missed?
  - A. So again, from my perspective, and I was fortunate to be in the organisation when our post-incident procedures had matured, there would be post-incident managers, there would be support for those officers, those subject officers through Federation or other staff associations depending on rank, so it should have been possible to ensure actually about me from the perspective of the post-incident manager that any of the relevant paperwork that could or should have been completed was completed and then, as necessary, provided to the PIRC or, you know, retained as part of the documents set following the incident.
    - Q. Right. So nothing to stop Police Scotland from requesting that if they become aware that forms haven't been filled in in terms of use of spray forms and I'm talking in particular about CS incapacitant spray?

- 1 Α. Now, again, a current post-incident manager would be able to give you an absolutely clear view on this, but 2 3 my anticipation would be that in terms of the checklist 4 of material that should be provided in the first 5 24 hours after a incident of a magnitude that requires a post-incident management to be set up, then I would 6 7 anticipate that had CS been discharged then that would have been one of the, if you like, documents on any 8 9 checklist to be completed and provided to either the 10 post-incident manager or further on to the PIRC. 11 Q. Right. 12 As I say, I need to check that with a current Α. 13 post-incident manager, but that would be one of, I would 14 anticipate, a raft of documents that would be completed 15 in the early stages following any post-incident investigation. 16 So it would be requested and it would be done now? Q. 18 Α. Yes, to the best -- certainly to the best of my
- 17
- 19 knowledge and awareness post-incident in my time in 20 Police Scotland if there were -- if there was a 21 responsibility on the officer or the post-incident 22 manager to be provided with a particular form or set of forms, that would be done. 23
- Now, I can never say never and there may well be 24 with an incident or I genuinely don't know, but my 25

1 anticipation would be, unless there were extenuating circumstances, those forms would be provided within the 2 3 prescribed timescale. 4 Q. So Police Scotland could request the forms and if 5 they're not provided, there could be an assessment carried out to consider whether there were extenuating 6 7 circumstances for the failure to comply? Yes, I think so. Understanding the circumstances behind 8 Α. 9 that failure to comply I think is important. 10 Q. Thank you. And we have heard evidence that in around August 2018, so after you have joined Police Scotland 11 12 and would that be at the time that you were appointed to 13 this particular role, this portfolio? 14 Do you know, I genuinely can't remember. I know that --Α. 15 I know that I came in as the local policing DCC. I think I was a local policing DCC for more than a 16 17 month, but again, apologies, I just can't remember when 18 there was a move around in portfolios. I'm sure it was the before the end of 2018, but whether it was as 19 20 quickly as August I genuinely can't remember. 21 Q. I think if I remember rightly when I looked at the 22 briefing note earlier that was 12 September. I'm not aware of anything being raised at that stage that a 23 decision had been taken by the crown not to prosecute, 24 but we have heard evidence that around about August 2018 25

1 that decision was or in the process of being taken. And we've also heard that there was an investigation into a 2 3 purported leak to the Mail On Sunday of the decision not 4 to prosecute and that was around about 23 September, 5 2018. 6 So it was around about that period in 2018 when it 7 became publicly known that a decision had been taken not to prosecute the officers. When did you become aware 8 9 that there had been a decision not to prosecute the officers? 10 I can't remember. I cannot give you a specific date 11 Α. 12 that on that, counsel, probably when the -- when Police Scotland was notified, but I can't -- I couldn't 13 say definitively when that was. 14 15 Q. But at the very least by the time there was a leak to 16 the newspaper and it became very publicly known, you would have known at that stage? 17 I don't know. I can't remember whether we would have 18 Α. 19 known beforehand or whether we would have known afterwards. I genuinely can't remember. 20 21 Q. All right. Thank you. So at some point you would have 22 become aware that the officers weren't being prosecuted? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. And it may have been around about that time, August or September 2018. What steps did you take at that stage 25

1 in connection with the Regulations, if any? So in terms of the officers not being prosecuted, I'm 2 Α. 3 very aware that there would have been I would refer to 4 it as victim's right to review. So there would be the 5 opportunity for the family through their legal representatives to go back to crown to ask for that 6 7 decision to be reconsidered. 8 Q. Mm-hmm. So again, you know, just following on from the 9 10 conversation that we had slightly earlier this morning, I wouldn't want to do anything to undermine any further 11 12 decision-making that might come from crown. We've -- our terms of reference exclude consideration of 13 Q. 14 the victim's right of review or VRR. 15 Α. Okay. But we've heard that that process was embarked upon. 16 Q. 17 That was in February 2019. So the decision not to 18 prosecute was taken around about August, it became public in September 2018, and then, ultimately, in 19 20 February of 2019, the VRR was formally sent in. 21 Now, there's no deadline imposed for CRR. It's not 22 the situation that a family wishing the decision to be reviewed have to complete a form within 14 days or 23 28 days. There's no deadline. So in the period 24 between, say, September 2018 and February 2019, what 25

1 steps did you take in relation to carry out an 2 assessment under the Regulations, so this is prior to a VRR being lodged? 3 4 Α. To my recollection, there were no steps taken at that 5 point in time. I may be wrong in that, counsel, but I don't remember there being any steps taken in terms of 6 7 any assessment at that point, simply because I don't think that we felt the proceedings were concluded. 8 Q. So given the concerns, the public concern and the work 9 10 that's been ongoing with the gold group and any other areas of Police Scotland, why was there no assessment 11 12 carried out in terms of the Regulations? Because, as I say, I don't think we were -- I think we 13 Α. 14 felt that there would be further potential for 15 consideration by crown, so it was a question of just let's -- let the process work through. So my 16 17 recollection is that there was no assessment made at 18 that point in time. 19 Right. Given your role and obviously the interests of Q. 20 the officers who are in -- have this hanging over them, 21 the concerns of the family, which you were aware of, and 22 the public concern, did you consider whether it was appropriate simply not to make that assessment under the 23 Regulations or whether that should be done? 24 Again, genuinely, I can't remember not -- I can't 25

1 remember taking a decision not to do it, but I can't remember if -- I have got -- I genuinely can't remember 2 3 taking a decision actively not to do it, but, equally, 4 there was no decision taken, to the best of my 5 knowledge, to carry out that assessment. So simply no consideration at that stage whether to do 6 Q. 7 anything under the Regulations? To the best of my recollection, you know. I may be 8 Α. 9 misremembering, but I don't recall. 10 Q. Okay. I don't recall having a conversation at that point in 11 Α. 12 time about any assessment. 13 Right. Well, looking back now, at that, given that we Q. 14 are here in a public inquiry, the only public inquiry 15 that Police Scotland have been involved in in relation to since 2015 in relation to this death, the fact that 16 17 no consideration at all was being given in terms of the 18 Regulations, do you think that that was perhaps a missed 19 opportunity to deal with that? So I still think that it was proper to -- should the --20 Α. 21 you know, should the family wish to review or ask crown 22 to review their decision-making, to allow that process to come to a conclusion prior to making any 23 determination. So in terms of the one -- I mean the 24

magnitude of the events which occurred on May in 2015

were incredibly significant, counsel. They were incredibly significant.

An assessment around whether or not one form was completed, which I think is the space that we're still in, one form was completed within that requisite 24-hour period, you know, perhaps we could have gone back and looked at that, there may have been other aspects we could have gone back and looked at that, however we didn't. I think I thought that the magnitude of the situation that crown should be -- that that process should be exhausted first.

Q. Well, I apologise if I have confused you. I have moved on from the spray. Perhaps we should take that from the screen. It is perhaps misleading.

I'm moving on to the situation where post

August/September 2018 a decision has been taken by the

crown not to initiate criminal proceedings. That is

known to you. You become aware of that. This is a much

bigger issue. It is a change now because you know the

crown are not prosecuting officers. It's not to do with

the sprayer spray.

So a decision is taken there's to be no criminal proceedings. Roughly at some point around about that period, you would have become aware of that. Would you agree that changes things in terms of the role that

- Police Scotland can take under the Regulations because there will not be criminal proceedings?
- 3 A. Potentially, yes.

9

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Yes. And then there's no deadlines for VRR and it's not actually a step that's taken until the February of 2019, and I'm asking about this period during, say, September, or slightly later October 2018, to February 2019, and what's steps, if any, were taken by Police Scotland in
- 10 A. So I'm not aware that there were any steps taken. My
  11 recall may be wrong, but I'm not aware that there were
  12 any steps taken at that point.

terms of the Regulations?

- Q. And given there's no obligation on the family to

  intimate or lodge a request for a right of review, they

  may not ultimately, and that's not actually done until

  the February, why was there no assessment under the

  regulations between -- for those -- that period?
  - A. So again, the Inquiry, the investigation, was carried out by the PIRC. So there was, you know, the logical issue of I don't think at that point we had disclosure of any -- now, again I may be wrong, counsel, but I don't think we had disclosure of material from the PIRC at that point in time.
- Q. We certainly heard that the PIRC report was not sent to
  Police Scotland --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- by PIRC or by the crown?
- 3 A. Yes. So again, in terms of what we would found any
- 4 assessment on then that would be the report of the
- 5 investigation into the circumstances surrounding the
- death of Mr Bayoh. So we didn't have that PIRC
- 7 investigation to the best of my knowledge and I think
- 8 you have confirmed that.
- 9 Q. So in terms of Police Scotland and the Regulations, you
- 10 would have considered the PIRC report to be necessary
- 11 before you could carry out an assessment?
- 12 A. In terms of that assessment being as complete as it
- could possibly be, it would have been helpful to have
- had that material, certainly.
- 15 Q. Did Police Scotland consider making their own
- investigation in terms of the Regulations?
- 17 A. Not to my knowledge, no.
- 18 Q. No. So even after the crown have taken the decision not
- 19 to prosecute, at that stage, no VRR has been lodged or
- intimated to the crown by the family, was there any
- 21 active lines of investigation adopted by Police Scotland
- 22 at that time to seek statements, recover documentation,
- 23 consider what had happened at Hayfield Road?
- A. No, because that material, as I recollect, was still
- 25 with the crown, so in terms of going and taking further

contemporaneously in 2015.

5

- statements there was no -- there was no -- there was no

  activity on the part of Police Scotland to go and take

  further statements from, for argument's sake, the

  subject officers, given that statements had been given
- Q. So, no attempts to either ask the officers who had been involved with the events with Mr Bayoh or officers who had attended Hayfield Road as to what they had seen, what they had heard?
- 10 A. So -- no, certainly, again, the statements which had

  11 been taken contemporaneously had been taken, you know,

  12 back in 2015, so to go back and to reinterview those

  13 officers some three or potentially four years later that

  14 was not -- that was not -- I don't recall there being

  15 consideration, certainly in the latter months of 2018 or

  16 early 2019, of doing that, counsel.
  - Q. No, consideration given to that possibility?
- A. So what I can't -- and this is a recollection issue for
  me. I cannot remember whether, in all good conscience,
  within the gold group we had those conversations, but
  certainly that activity was not undertaken.
- Q. Right. So that activity was not undertaken, but we may be able to get minutes from those gold groups?
- A. There should be minutes, absolutely, yes.
- 25 Q. And if there was a discussion during those meetings of

1 the gold group at that time, if there were discussions about whether Police Scotland should start to gather in 2 3 information and do an assessment under the Regulations, 4 they would be noted in the minutes presumably? 5 That would be my anticipation, yes, yes. Α. Do you have any recollection of that type of discussion 6 Q. 7 taking place in the gold group? Genuinely, no, I don't, but that's not to say that it 8 Α. 9 didn't taken place, but I have no recollection of it 10 taking place, certainly not in 2018 into 2019. But ultimately, in any event, no steps were taken in 11 Q. 12 relation to investigating matters yourselves? Not at that point, no. 13 Α. Can I look at something else --14 Q. 15 LORD BRACADALE: Just before you do that, Ms Grahame. 16 Ms Taylor, it's clear that at that point, having the PIRC report would have been, as you put it, helpful at 17 the very least. Did you explore at all with the crown 18 or the PIRC whether you could get the PIRC report? 19 Sir, I can't remember whether we did or not. You're 20 Α. 21 right it would have been incredibly valuable. We may 22 well have had that conversation, but I suspect we would have pended that conversation until, as I have explained 23 to counsel, we understood whether the family wanted to 24 exercise their right to review. 25

1 LORD BRACADALE: Looking to the future, would it assist those responsible for misconduct proceedings in the 2 3 police to have the PIRC report --4 Α. Yes, I think --5 LORD BRACADALE: -- at a point where proceedings were not being taken? 6 7 Α. Yes, sir, I think it would and this is a set of circumstances that we have experienced on occasion with 8 9 PIRC that they have carried out an investigation, they 10 still have the report and because the investigation has been carried out by PIRC's investigators, 11 12 Police Scotland doesn't have a full set of whether that statements or indeed all the facts in front of them. 13 14 So, yes, I think that would be incredibly valuable. 15 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. MS GRAHAME: And given there's no deadline on the family 16 17 seeking a VRR, would Police Scotland have left this indefinitely if the family had taken a year to think 18 19 about whether to lodge a VRR? So I think we absolutely have to give the family agency 20 Α. 21 in this, counsel, you know, really, really try -- my 22 anticipation, a traumatic set of circumstances, take the time that they need to take to decide what their next 23 steps should be. Once, you know, there was -- and of 24 course the situation was then further complicated by the 25

1 announcement by the then Justice Secretary of a public inquiry to be held into the death of Mr Bayoh. But once 2 3 that determination by crown had been taken that there 4 was going to be, no -- there was going to be -- there 5 were going to be no criminal proceedings taken against the officers, under any other circumstances, I would 6 7 anticipate that when the paperwork were then received back in Police Scotland the issue of conduct could then 8 be properly assessed. 9 10 Q. So you anticipated that at some point the paperwork 11 would be received by Police Scotland from PIRC or the 12 crown? 13 Yes. Α. 14 Q. Was it ever? 15 Not to my knowledge, no. Α. 16 Q. No. You know, until the -- until the circumstances 17 Α. 18 surrounding the public inquiry and disclosure and the 19 like. 20 Given your comments about the family and the -- and very Q. 21 rightly they can take as much as time as they wish to 22 consider whether to lodge a VRR, and given your views about the Regulations until that process has concluded, 23

is it fair to say that until a VRR is concluded, there

will be no assessment by Police Scotland under the

24

1 Regulations?

9

10

11

23

- A. Again, I'm never in the stage of being utterly binary
  around anything, but I think, again, given the gravity
  of the events of 2015 and given our absolute
  determination not to interfere with any decisions that
  crown might take explicitly or implicitly, in these
  circumstances, I think that was the appropriate
  approach.
  - Q. So if the family take a year or two years or three years to take a view to lodge a VRR, Police Scotland would take no steps under the Regulations during that period?
- 12 Α. So again, I think there would logically come a point in 13 time, whether that's three months, six months, 14 12 months, 18 months, where we would say, look, there 15 are outstanding matters here, there are still issues, counsel, issues that the officers themselves have not 16 17 been concluded in terms of will they face any misconduct 18 or not as a consequence of the situation that occurred 19 back in 2015, so, no, I think at some point there would 20 have a, okay, look, if nothing is happening here, this 21 is not concluded, we need to bring it to some kind of 22 conclusion, how might we go about doing that.
  - Q. And whose responsibility would it be to say the point has now been reached?
- 25 A. Again, given the significance of the events of 2015,

- I would anticipate that would be a conversation that

  would be had between the Chief Constable, the designated

  deputy, and very probably the ACC Professionalism along

  with our legal colleagues, counsel.
  - Q. Was there ever any discussion between you and the ACC and the Chief Constable about whether that stage had been reached --
- 8 A. No.

- 9 Q. -- in this matter?
- 10 A. No, because we didn't think it had. I certainly didn't 11 feel that it had.
- Q. I mean is there any guidance available to someone such
  as yourself in that role that that point should be
  considered even after three months, six months, nine
  months, a year, or is it simply left to individual
  discretion?
  - A. So I think the decision-makers in any situation such as this are very senior and very experienced, so actually I think that is probably more valuable than any policy in these circumstances. Certainly there is no policy to the best of my awareness, but, again, I might not be aware that that policy exists, but I'm not aware of any policy. But I think, you know, certainly with the Chief Constable at the time having been within Police Scotland over the period of the events 2015, ACC Spiers likewise,

albeit in a more junior capacity, and myself coming in,

if you like, with a fresh perspective, there would have

been significant experience sat within that group of

people, supported by our legal advisors around should we

now be changing our focus and potentially looking to

pursue other elements -- outstanding elements from the

death of Mr Bayoh.

- Q. It's left to the discretion of individuals to decide whether that question should be asked, even if there's no VRR?
- A. That's right, but there would be no intention on the part of Police Scotland. This wouldn't ever have, if you like, to use, I don't know, a term that might be used if you're a pilot, this would never have disappeared off the radar. You said right at the beginning of the conversation this morning, counsel, just how important and iconic an event this was, how important for Police Scotland to maintain community confidence and the confidence of the family. So this would never just have fizzled out.

We would always have at some point said, look, there is more yet, here that needs to be done and whether that is a consequence of asking if there's going to be no -- we're obviously into the public inquiry space -- but if there's no public inquiry, then we would be into the

1 space of saying to the PIRC, can you disclose that documentation to us, please, so we can conclude those 2 3 conduct assessments and the like that we need to do as a 4 consequence of that. Even though it wasn't done here, it would have been done 5 Q. at some point at some stage? 6 7 There are no circumstances that we under -- that we Α. could possibly have allowed this just to continue 8 9 indefinitely, counsel. We would have had to have 10 brought it back or had that conversation with PIRC to bring this back in at some point so we could conclude 11 12 all of the activity which needed to be concluded around 13 the investigation. But from the point that the VRR was lodged by the 14 Q. 15 family, then at that stage, again, Police Scotland chose not to take any steps under the Regulations and to allow 16 17 to process to take its own time to conclude? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Can I ask you to clarify one part of your statement, Q. 20 answer 9. There we are. We'll have to look at the 21 question as well, sorry. This might take us a moment. 22 So if we look at the Rule 8 request, this is SBPI 00547, it's on the screen, and it's dated 28 March, 2024. 23 24 And the question is:

"In your capacity as head of the Discipline

1 Portfolio and/or as Chair of the Sheku Bayoh gold group, were you responsible for recommending or actioning any 2 3 Police Scotland disciplinary proceedings in respect of 4 any of the officers involved in the incident involving 5 Sheku Bayoh on 3 May 2015 or any officer involved in any aspect of the Police Scotland post-incident management?" 6 7 So the question is, were you responsible, and then the subsequent follow-up question was if not, who was 8 9 responsible? 10 And then if we can look at your actual answer, number 9, "No". That suggests you weren't responsible, 11 12 but I think you have already clarified that point in 13 terms of the evidence this morning. A. Yes, so I wasn't -- I didn't take any -- I didn't 14 15 recommend or action any Police Scotland disciplinary proceedings in respect of the officers involved in the 16 17 incident involving Sheku Bayoh on 3 May 2015 or any officer involved in any aspect of Police Scotland 18 19 post-incident management. As we've discussed, I didn't 20 recommend any disciplinary proceedings and, again, back 21 to that further delegation of the conduct -- complaints 22 and conduct responsibilities to the ACC Professionalism. Q. And you say -- then say: 23 "Decision-making is delegated from the Chief 24 Constable to ACC Professionalism." 25

1

2 Α. Yes. So if the Chair is reading that paragraph, I think, 3 Q. 4 would you agree, he should consider your fuller evidence 5 today? 6 Yes. Α. 7 Q. Thank you. Thank you. 8 Α. Can we move back to the Regulations, please. I would 9 Q. 10 like to move on to Regulation 8 and this is the one that relates to suspension. Regulation 8.1: 11 12 "A constable may be suspended from the office of 13 constable by a Senior constable if an allegation comes 14 to the Senior constable's attention from which it can 15 reasonably be inferred that any conduct of the constable may constitute a criminal offence or amount to 16 17 misconduct or gross misconduct." 18 So three opposites there: misconduct, gross misconduct, or potentially a criminal offence. 19 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. And again, there's a reference to that phrase, "From 22 which it can reasonably be inferred". So is there some sort of assessment carried out by Police Scotland under 23 Regulation 8 with regard to suspension? 24 Yes. 25 Α.

I think again earlier today you have clarified that.

- 1 Q. And who carries that out?
- A. A member of the senior management team within the Senior

  Standards Department, albeit with if we were to -- or
- 4 when Police Scotland would take or when Police Scotland
- 5 took the step of suspending a member of police staff or
- 6 indeed a police officer but particularly a police
- 7 officer given these recommendations, that
- 8 recommendations would be put to the ACC Professionalism
- 9 and the ACC Professionalism would take the final
- 10 decision because this is a really significant issue for
- 11 the officer concerned, the ACC Professionalism would
- 12 take the final decision on whether or not to suspend.
- Q. And when you say he would take the final decision, would
- 14 that be something that would be part of the discussions
- with the DCC to approve it or disagree with it, would
- 16 you have the authority to disagree or approve of that
- 17 decision?
- 18 A. So what would generally happen is non-contentious
- 19 suspensions, and there were a number of non-contentious
- 20 suspensions, the ACC Professionalism would spend that
- 21 officer. If there was any -- if the circumstances were
- 22 such that he wanted a second opinion or wanted the
- 23 benefit of additional experience, then he and I would
- 24 discuss those matters and ultimately come to a decision.
- 25 What I asked for on a regular basis was an understanding

25

Α.

1 of who had been suspended and why, again, counsel, to understand whether there were any themes or trends 2 emerging in the conduct of officers within 3 4 Police Scotland that necessitated some more strategic 5 intervention around training or the like but largely sits with the ACC Professionalism. 6 7 Q. And in a case such as this involving the death of Mr Bayoh, is that the type of situation, serious 8 situation, where you would expect some sort of 9 10 conversation with the ACC Professionalism? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. And whatever decision was being recommended by him or 13 taken by him, is that something you could interfere 14 with? 15 If I felt that the ACC was making the wrong decision, Α. then I would certainly have that conversation with him 16 17 and put the other -- my concerns or considerations to them, to say, "Look, actually, I think the threshold for 18 suspension is met here" or indeed "I don't think the 19 20 threshold for suspension is met", you know, a particular 21 set of restrictions on a subject officer will serve the 22 same effect. Q. What does it mean when you say "the threshold for 23 24 suspension", explain to us what that would be?

So very much sits within the Regulation 8, counsel,

1 constitute a criminal offence or amount to misconduct or 2 gross misconduct. Gross misconduct, the threshold was 3 generally was -- there was no concern or consideration 4 given to if an officer was reasonably inferred to have 5 committed gross misconduct, then suspension is very likely under the circumstances going to be the right 6 7 approach. However, if it was more -- if it was simple misconduct which might not lead to an officer losing his 8 9 or her job, their job, then there would probably under those circumstances be a conversation around whether 10 suspension was appropriate or not, so again at the 11 12 higher end of the scale highly unlikely to be any -- any 13 disagreement if you like or any deep conversation 14 needing to be had, but if it was, you know, simple 15 misconduct, then there would have to be a very good case made for that to constitute a behaviour that was -- that 16 17 was subject to suspension bearing in mind the impact 18 that suspension has on an officer so it's that balancing 19 exercise. 20 Okay. So the phrase "reasonably be inferred", is that Q. 21 on the basis of likelihood or reasonable suspicion or 22 can you explain? A. Or the circumstances which are provided to the 23 investigating officers in DPS in terms of the behaviour 24

that the officer is alleged to have committed.

- Q. And when you're assessing whether it's reasonable, that
  it can reasonably be inferred, how is that assessed, is
  it on the basis of likelihood, balance of probabilities,
  is it a reasonable suspicion?
  - A. So again, counsel, in terms of an absolute up-to-date understanding of how that assessment is made, I would refer you to colleagues in PSD who deal with this -- who make these assessments on an ongoing basis, day in and day out, who then bring them to the ACC Professionalism so they would be better placed than me to give you go a firsthand account of how that officer carries out that balancing exercise.
    - Q. But if there are occasions where you are asked to comment on suspension and you know the Regulations say and use this phrase "reasonably be inferred", so you're looking at whether it can reasonably be inferred that conduct constitutes misconduct, gross misconduct or criminal offence, how do you assess that when you're saying, well, your decision is wrong or I think you're right?
  - A. So the ACC would describe to me the circumstances that pertain to the particular officer or group of officers, the seriousness of the conduct that which is alleged, but then also as I say the balancing exercise around our duty of care to that officer and their personal

23

24

25

1 circumstances and whether actually suspension may be an 2 option but because of their personal circumstances it 3 may be better to keep them in the workplace in order 4 that they can be supervised, be supported, be provided 5 with the opportunity to carry out restricted duties which would mean that whilst they weren't suspended, 6 7 they weren't able to interfere with any ongoing investigation but their welfare and well-being needs 8 9 could also be attended to because that is something 10 which is, you know, incredibly important for us, it is balancing the needs of the officer and the requirement 11 12 of Police Scotland to maintain public confidence in the 13 discipline processes. Q. I'm focusing on the question of whether something can be 14 15 reasonably inferred to be say for example misconduct. 16 Is there a part of that assessment where you look at the 17 weight of evidence, the quality of evidence, and assess 18 to what extent that is probable, likely, whether it's --19 gives rise to a reasonable suspicion, was there any 20 element of the assessment that focuses on that? 21 Α. That would be part of the assessment but as I say, in 22 terms of understanding, you know, the practicalities and

the delivery of that assessment on a day-to-day basis,

- 1 more, you know, serious matters which required an officer to be suspended. The conversations that I would 2 3 have with Alan would often be in the space of, "well, is 4 it right, is it proportionate to spend or is there 5 another option in terms of how we manage this officer while the investigation moves forward". Now, again, 6 7 counsel, we may choose to restrict an officer in the first instance because there's a reasonable inference 8 9 that the conduct that they have engaged in amounts to 10 simple misconduct but as the investigation goes forward, we might actually uncover more evidence that suggests 11 12 that actually this is gross misconduct potentially 13 that's being committed by this officer, therefore actually the grounds for suspension are met. 14 15 Q. Can that be reviewed in an ongoing basis? So -- now, statutory in England and Wales, I believe 16 Α. it's statutory in Scotland but it's certainly good 17 18 practice in Scotland and there is a review of every 19 suspended officer carried out by ACC Professionalism 20 every 28 days.
- Q. And what if an officer isn't suspended but further
  information and evidence is becoming available, is there
  also a review?
- A. There would be a review if, for arguments sake, we have an officer who's restricted, there is an investigation

1 ongoing into that officer, the staff in the PSD uncover more -- more evidence, for argument's sake, if we have 2 3 an officer who is suspected of domestic abuse and in the 4 first instance, you know, it's -- there isn't a direct 5 report but there is a suspicion that this officer has been involved in domestic abuse, for argument's sake, 6 7 and then we have a direct complaint for -- but it's probably a bad example but it's just to say the officers 8 9 in PSD, they would go, they would speak to the 10 witnesses, they would speak to complainants, they would understand the gravity and nature of offences or 11 12 allegations against a particular officer and that would 13 feed back into any review process around whether an 14 officer should be if you like escalated from restriction 15 to suspension. But if there's a PIRC investigation, that process isn't 16 Q. 17 carried out? 18 Α. So again that's not necessarily always the case. I 19 referred earlier this morning to a set of circumstances 20 where there was an initial investigation by 21 Police Scotland, it was clear to us that the situation 22 was a pretty grave situation, there was a referral, I can't remember if it was crown-directed or from the 23 chief to PIRC to take the investigation on, but the 24 officer who was at the centre of that investigation was 25

```
suspended.
 1
 2
         Q. Right. I'm conscious of the time. Perhaps that would
 3
             be ...?
         LORD BRACADALE: We'll stop for lunch now and sit at
 4
 5
             2 o'clock.
         (1.02 pm)
 6
 7
                             (Luncheon adjournment)
 8
         (2.04 pm)
 9
         LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
10
         MS GRAHAME: Thank you. We had just turned to look at
11
             Regulation 8 of the 2014 Regulations and I would like to
12
             go back to that, please. And we were talking about a
             Constable may be suspended if an allegation comes to the
13
14
             attention of Police Scotland from which it can
15
             reasonably be inferred that the conduct may be
16
             misconduct, gross misconduct or a criminal offence. So
17
             some consideration again required, but the constable may
             be suspended --
18
19
            Yes.
         Α.
20
         Q. -- for any of those reasons.
21
                 Subparagraph 2:
                 "But a Senior constable must not suspend another
22
             constable unless at least one of the conditions
23
24
             mentioned in paragraph 3 is satisfied."
25
                 So the officer must not be suspended if at least one
```

1		of the conditions is satisfied; is that correct?
2	Α.	Yes, one of the conditions must be satisfied in order
3		for the grounds for
4	Q.	One must be satisfied?
5	А.	At least one for the grounds for suspension to be
6		satisfied.
7	Q.	So he cannot be suspended unless at least one of these
8		two conditions exists and is satisfied?
9	Α.	They should not be suspended, yes.
10	Q.	And it does say "must not be suspended."
11		So the suspension conditions are:
12		"(a) an effective criminal or misconduct
13		investigation may be prejudiced if the Constable is not
14		suspended."
15		(b) if we can move up the screen:
16		"Having regard to the nature of the allegation and
17		any other relevant considerations, the public interest
18		requires the Constable's suspension."
19		And I'm interested in your experience of how
20		consideration is given to whether either of these
21		conditions exists, is satisfied, and if we can maybe go
22		back to (a):
23		"So an effective criminal or misconduct
24		investigation may be prejudiced if the Constable is not
25		suspended."

1 Now, clearly, if there is no criminal investigation 2 underway or misconduct investigation, that cannot be prejudiced, so if that has concluded matters, have 3 4 resolved, that cannot apply, but in relation to --5 Lost my train of thought there, sorry. Can we move on to (b), first of all: 6 7 "Having regard to the nature of the allegation and any other relevant considerations, the public interest 8 9 requires the Constable's suspension." 10 I have just remembered what I was going to say, 11 sorry. Could we go back to (a), sorry about that. 12 I was going to ask you about we said if the criminal 13 investigation has come to an end, that's obviously not a 14 condition that can be satisfied. It could not be 15 prejudiced once it's concluded. But in a situation where there's a criminal investigation ongoing, how do 16 17 Police Scotland satisfy themselves, and in particular 18 you or one of your delegated officers, satisfy 19 themselves that there may be prejudice to the criminal 20 investigation, do you contact PIRC, do you contact 21 crown, what do you do? 22 So to give you an example there and clearly it's only Α. one example, the prejudice may occur if, for argument's 23 sake, the officer remains in the workplace, they are 24 restricted rather than suspended, they still have access 25

to force systems they may delete material from force systems or they may go back into aspects of, I don't know, reports or policies or proformas that they shouldn't have access to. There's something about if an officer is suspended then generally their access to force systems are removed so there is no opportunity for them, if you like to tamper, and I use that word advisedly, with any of the evidence or the material which may form part of the conduct or criminal proceedings. The other issue or the other aspect of prejudice if 

The other issue or the other aspect of prejudice if the Constable is not suspended is whether that Constable would bring undue pressure to bear if they were still in the workplace, potentially on other colleagues who may be witnesses. So there is the -- there is, again, a rationale for suspension and you will get this, counsel, in much more detail for those who are doing this on a day-to-day basis, but there is also a rationale around if that individual officer were to remain in the workplace, would they -- would they have the opportunity to attempt to put pressure on any of their colleagues to change what they might say in the course of the investigation.

Q. How common is it to suspended an officer if the view is taken that there has been misconduct, gross misconduct

or a criminal offence? 1 2 So suspension is not common. I'm just trying to and, Α. 3 forgive me, I can't remember the number of officers who were suspended when I retired from Police Scotland. I 4 5 have a feeling it might have -- I genuinely can't remember. There's a figure in my mind, but I'm not sure 6 7 whether it's right, but it's a very, very small subset of police officers within Police Scotland. I think it's 8 9 around about the very, very low three figures, but, 10 please, don't take that as the actual situation with officers who are suspended. We would need to check the 11 12 figures for you, which we can do, but it is a small 13 number who are suspend. But if the situation and the 14 circumstances warrant the suspension of an officer, then 15 they will be suspended but the numbers are small. There are far more officers who are under investigation who 16 17 are restricted, on restricted duties, remaining in the 18 workplace than there are suspended. 19 But someone would be applying their minds to the Q. 20 question of whether an effective criminal or misconduct 21 investigation may be prejudiced and their mind would be 22 applied to that, they would give consideration to that,

A. That's right, in terms of any suspension, yes.

restriction of duties?

23

24

25

before a decision is taken regarding any suspension or

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And is a report prepared, is there a document prepared which sets out the reasoning?
- So, yes, there is. As we discussed I think just before 3 Α. 4 lunch, my recollection is that there is a document which 5 is completed by colleagues in PSD. Again, I think from memory and this may have changed since I retired from 6 7 Police Scotland, that document is then presented to one of the Superintendents within PSD setting out the 8 9 rationale for a decision to spend, that will then go to the ACC Professionalism, again to the best of my 10 recollection, and the ACC Professionalism is the 11 12 ultimate decision-maker and weighs the evidence that has 13 been provided to him. It was a him at that point in 14 time.
  - Q. And if the question is asked, consideration is given, and a decision is taken not to suspend, but that process has been followed, is that also something that's noted in a report or a document of some kind?
    - A. That would be -- again, because I haven't filled these documents in myself, I'm slightly wary about describing them to you, but what I would anticipate would happen is there will be the rationale for agreeing suspension or actually saying, no, I don't think this meets the threshold for suspension, but it may well meet the threshold for restriction, either on the same document

22

23

24

25

Q.

Q.

A. Yes.

A. Yes.

or on a document which is attached for the overview for 1 2 the ACC to take a decision on suspension. And did you ever see those documents as part of a 3 Q. 4 discussion, a wider discussion, with you as DCC? 5 I don't recall ever seeing the documents, no. I don't Α. recall ever seeing the documents. 6 7 In your role would that have been information shared Q. through a conversation with the ACC? 8 Yes. 9 Α. 10 Q. But if that question has been considered and an assessment has been made, then there will be some 11 12 document of some description that we can recover? 13 Α. Yes. And let's look at (b), please. So this is the second 14 Q. 15 condition: "Having regard to the nature of the allegation and 16 17 any other relevant considerations, the public interest requires the Constable's suspension." 18 19 And again, is this something that is assessed to see 20 whether that condition can be satisfied? 21 Α. Yes.

And is the same process carried out?

And a document prepared?

- 1 Q. And recommending suspension or restriction or nothing?
- 2 A. Yes, yes, that's absolute right and those documents and,
- again, I am talking to you slightly at arm's length
- 4 here, because, as I say, that's the role of the
- 5 Assistant Chief Constable rather than myself, but those
- documents will be reviewed relating to individual
- 7 officers on a 28-day repeating cycle to ensure the
- 8 conditions for that officer's suspension remain valid.
- 9 Q. How is the public interest assessed?
- 10 A. So that will be predominantly around public confidence
- in policing in Scotland and what a reasonable person
- might expect the police service to do should an officer
- engage in a particular type of conduct.
- 14 Q. Right. And is there a particular source used to assess
- 15 what the public interest is or whether public confidence
- is high or low or --
- A. So again, that's quite a complex question, because,
- again, I think public interest may actually vary
- 19 dependent on the circumstances that the individual
- officer is suspected of. For example, if an officer has
- 21 engaged in racist conduct towards members of the public
- or towards their colleagues, if the officer has been
- 23 involved in acts of domestic abuse or domestic violence
- or violence against women and girls, because of the
- 25 sensitivities, because of the nature of the public

1 interest in issues, rightly so, in issues such as those, the public interest test for certain types of behaviours 2 3 may be slightly different to the public interest test 4 for others. 5 For argument's sake, if an officer had been found to have been drink driving, for example, the public 6 7 interest in suspending that officer as a consequence of their having been drink driving might be different to 8 the public interest test if an officer was suspected of 9 10 being racially discriminatory towards members of the 11 public. 12 Q. How would you describe the public interest in a 13 situation where a black man has died after having come into contact with the police? 14 15 Α. Yes, I think that's acute is. Acute. So in relation to Mr Bayoh, you would say that 16 Q. was acute? 17 18 Α. Absolutely. 19 If the Regulation requires one of these conditions to be Q. 20 satisfied, are you able to help us understand why this 21 condition about public interest requiring the 22 Constable's suspension was not satisfied in this case? So again, it's difficult for me to talk to the situation 23 Α. back in 2015. As I have explained in terms of the 24 period of time where I was in Police Scotland, there 25

- 1 were still other sort of process ongoing. The officers
- were still in the workplace. I can't remember, counsel,
- 3 whether any of them were restricted or were potentially
- 4 away from the workplace.
- 5 Q. I'll be corrected if I'm wrong, but I'm not aware of any
- 6 suspensions.
- 7 A. I don't think there were any suspensions.
- 8 Q. I am not aware of any restrictions. I'm aware that two
- 9 officers at least were off sick.
- 10 A. Yes, and officers have subsequently retired.
- 11 Q. Yes, but I'm not aware of any restrictions on their
- duties or suspensions.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. No one is shouting out that I have got that wrong.
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. So I think that's probably correct.
- 17 A. Yes, I think that's correct.
- Q. So bearing that in mind, clearly they weren't suspended
- 19 here, they weren't put on restricted duties, but public
- 20 interest was as you've said acute --
- 21 A. [Yes --
- Q. -- can you explain?
- 23 A. That public interest and the confidence of communities
- I think has to be supported by a rigorous, an
- 25 independent and a thorough investigation into the

- circumstances of any incident or event, so certainly the

  public interest would be, I think, absolutely engaged in

  the death of a young black man at the hands of police

  officers, but also I do think it's important that a

  thorough investigation is carried out to understand the

  circumstances that pertain to that tragic -- that tragic

  sequence of events.
  - Q. And where that public interest is strong, acute, as you put it, and there is also at the same time going to be an investigation, is there a view -- when you were in the role, was there a view that if the investigation is rigorous, independent and thorough, that that is a counterbalance to the public interest in having the Constable suspended?
    - A. I think it can be, yes. I think it can be but, again, referring back to the set of circumstances this morning, that I described this morning, I think both of those conditions were met in terms of that particular suspension involvement, potential interaction with an ongoing investigation, but also because of the nature of the allegations the suspension was required to maintain public confidence notwithstanding the fact there was an independent investigation being carried on by the PIRC at that time. So again every set of circumstances, I think, should be regarded on its own -- taken on its

1 own merits.

Q. Right. And in what -- can you help us understand where the range lies where you have a very strong acute public interest, perhaps in favour of suspending the officer, but an independent investigation being carried out.

Now, you have talked about one example where the balance was that that officer should be suspended and you've talked about the public interest in that case being so strong, to what extent was the public interest in that case -- I appreciate you don't want to give us the circumstances, but to what extent was the public interest in that case even more significant or even less significant than in relation to the death of a black man?

A. Very different, very different and that's I suppose the point I probably clumsily tried to make about public interest isn't homogenous. There's -- there are a number of -- any number of sets of circumstances potentially that could engage the public interest, they're not all the same, they can be very different and of course there's a huge difference between what the public is interested in and a series of events which actually, you know, it is in the public interest as a consequence to suspend an individual officer. So that contrast I think doesn't necessarily -- that contrast

1 between sets of circumstances doesn't necessarily 2 mitigate against suspension in one case and not 3 suspending in another. I think every set of circumstances should be taken on its merits. 4 5 And of course what I should say is that PIRC investigation, you know, rigorous, robust, independent, 6 7 you know, the officers as well, you know, need to be sort of considered, their welfare and their well-being 8 in all of this. 9 10 Q. In assessing condition (b) or assessing either of those conditions? 11 12 A. So I think back to the point of, well, we could suspend 13 but is it better to keep an officer in the workplace 14 because one or other of those conditions may not apply, 15 counsel. Right. Obviously the family are members of the public. 16 Q. Of course. 17 Α. 18 Was there any other part of that process regarding Q. public interest -- did any part of that involve finding 19 20 out the family's views? 21 Α. Back in 2015, I'm not sure. I don't know at that stage, 22 but certainly by the time I was a DCC within Police Scotland, and there were various processes in 23 train in respect of the subject officers in the 24 investigation of Mr Bayoh's death, I don't recall 25

1 speaking to the family -- speaking to the family 2 specifically in respect of -- or the family having the 3 opportunity to speak to Police Scotland specifically in 4 the context of, you know, will Police Scotland suspend 5 the officers. When you were in the role, obviously at a later stage, 6 Q. 7 2015 onwards, was that something that you would have considered to be a relevant consideration in the 8 9 assessment of condition (b)? 10 Α. Had I been in the role in 2015? No, if when you were in the role in 2018 onwards, did 11 Q. 12 you consider taking accounts of the family's views when 13 you were assessing condition (b) about public interest? I would hope always to take account of the family's 14 Α. 15 views, yes. Right. So there would be nothing to prevent 16 Q. 17 Police Scotland from taking account of the family's views if they wished to? 18 19 That's right, through their proper sort of legal Α. 20 representatives. 21 Q. Legal representatives? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Q. Thank you. Can I move on in the Regulations to part 2, 24 "Misconduct Investigations", and I'm particularly 25

1 interested in Regulation 10, so this is Part 2, and this is "Preliminary Assessment". 2 3 Now, I'm going to read this out, but I will be 4 asking you some questions about some of the evidence you 5 gave earlier today. So this is an assessment within the terms of the Regulations. It's called "A Preliminary 6 7 Assessments", and it says: "This Regulation applies if a misconduct allegation 8 9 comes to the attention of the Deputy Chief Constable. 10 The Deputy Chief Constable must assess whether the conduct which is the subject matter of the misconduct 11 12 allegation would, if that conduct were proved, amount to 13 misconduct, gross misconduct or neither." 14 Now earlier today we talked about an initial 15 assessment carried out by the Professional Standards Department? 16 17 Yes. Α. 18 And that was separate from the Regulations. I made a Q. 19 point saying I want to know. This was an assessment 20 carried out within the body of the Regulations. Having 21 looked at that now, can you tell me, this initial 22 assessment you were talking about, was this completely 23 separate from the Regulations or was it under 24 Regulation 10? So sorry. Just help me out here, counsel, the initial 25

1 assessment? 2 Do you remember your evidence this morning about --Q. 3 I was asking about an assessment being carried out and 4 we started talking about the initial assessment being 5 carried out as to whether or not there was any misconduct and you had talked about an honest mistake, 6 7 so an assessment was carried out after which the decision maybe taken that this will be rerouted or 8 diverted away from the regulation -- regulatory 9 10 framework. And we talked about that at some length and then what we see here is an initial assessment about 11 12 misconduct, but this is within the regulatory framework. 13 Α. Yes. And I want to just be quite clear if I have completely 14 Q. 15 understood your evidence on this. So, yes, that initial assessment if an issue surrounding 16 Α. 17 the conduct of an officer comes to the attention of a Senior Constable should be done within the confines 18 of -- or should be carried out within the confines of 19 20 Regulation 10. 21 Right. So it's not as if there's an informal, Q. 22 non-regulatory assessment being carried out, it would be an assessment under Regulation 10? 23 A. It would be an assessment under Regulation 10 and there 24

are various routes then off of that initial assessment

1 under Regulation 10. 2 Again, what I would say, counsel, is I am right at 3 the right-hand side of my personal experience, because 4 it was not -- I did not carry out these assessments 5 myself, they were delegated to the ACC and then clearly carried out by individuals within the Professional 6 7 Standards Department, but Regulation 10 was the -- is the assessment, if you like, process for conduct. 8 Q. It comes to the police attention that there's an issue 9 10 about someone's conduct, that awareness then triggers an assessment under Regulation 10. 11 12 Α. If the conduct rules are engaged. 13 And --Q. Or conduct regulations are engaged. 14 Α. 15 Q. If it is a failing of the standard, professional standard, and an assessment will be carried out and that 16 17 assessment will cover the question of whether this could 18 be misconduct, gross misconduct or neither. So it could 19 be an honest mistake, a genuine error, and it will then 20 be diverted away from the Regulations if that's the 21 case, but there will be that assessment carried out. 22 Α. Yes. And some will be diverted and some will remain within 23 Q. the Regulations and then follow whatever route is 24 25 required depending on the conduct.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Right.
- 3 A. But that I have to say, counsel, is very high level from
- 4 a DCC's perspective.
- 5 Q. Right.
- 6 A. I say the granularity that you would get around that
- 7 process from speaking to a practitioners would be much
- greater than that that which I can furnish.
- 9 Q. That's absolutely -- thank you. Thank you for clearing
- 10 that up.
- I would like to move on now to some events that took
- 12 place in 2019 and still under reference to the
- Regulations and one of the things I'm interested in is
- an opinion of Lord Woolman in relation to a petitions
- for judicial review and you have talked about people
- 16 retiring?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And this is in connection -- it's a public document --
- 19 it's in connection with the applications for judicial
- 20 review by PC Paton and PC Short. Now, we have heard
- 21 both of them were un-- absent from work through ill
- 22 health for a period and we're aware that they sought to
- 23 retire on the grounds of ill health and that petition
- 24 was lodged in relation to that, because I think there
- 25 was resistence from the Scottish Police Authority for

their retirement. And I'm interested in exploring this 1 issue about the retirement and the misconduct 2 3 proceedings. Perhaps we should look, first of all, at the opinion 4 5 which I understand is available on the screen, although, as I say, this is a publicly available document and it's 6 7 from 2019 and you'll see there "Opinion of Lord Woolman" and the date is April 2018, if we move down the screen. 8 9 There we are. And it relates to the circumstances 10 surrounding Mr Bayoh's death and, as I have said, both of these officers wished to retire, that was declined 11 12 and they then sought judicial review of that matter. 13 Can we look, first of all, paragraph 4, please. So 14 you'll see the officers challenged the decision of the 15 SPA, advanced arguments in relation to why they felt they should be permitted to retire and in relation to 16 17 the judicial review against the decision by the SPA that they should not be permitted to retire. And I'm 18 interested in looking at C. So it says: 19 20 "The decision is irrational having regard to ... " 21 And there's three categories, three lines of 22 argument presented, and C says. "The absence of any intimation to them that they 23 will face either prosecution or internal disciplinary 24 proceedings in respect to Mr Bayoh's death." 25

1 And then if we look at paragraph 8, it's noted in 2 the opinion at the very last sentence: 3 "They have not received any intimation that they 4 face misconduct proceedings in connection with the incident." 5 6 And so it would appear that at this stage, by 7 April 2019, none of the officers who attended Hayfield Road had received any intimation at any time 8 9 that they faced or may face misconduct proceedings; was 10 that your understanding of the position at that time? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Yes. And when you came into your role in 2018, did you Q. 13 ever have a discussion about whether misconduct 14 proceedings should be commenced or initiated against the 15 officers? 16 So I think there was always an anticipation, counsel, at Α. 17 a point in time where we were in possession of the -and this of course, you know, precludes the setting up 18 of a public inquiry, but there was always -- there was 19 20 an anticipation at some point when we received the 21 relevant documentation from the PIRC, then that would be 22 assessed by colleagues within the Professional Standards Department and determinations around whether there 23 should or should not be any conducts processes taken 24 25 forward, as we discussed before lunch, would be made.

- 1 Q. So that would be at the point you had documentation --
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. -- that allowed the police to carry out an assessment?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. In terms of the Regulations and it would trigger the
- 6 process --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- at that stage?
- 9 So for officers who -- obviously, in this case, two
  10 officers wished to retire and we've heard ultimately
- 11 they did. Now, what can Police Scotland do -- where
- officers ultimately do retire, what can Police Scotland
- do in relation to misconduct proceedings?
- 14 A. So that's a very good point and this is clearly -- this
- is medical retirement which is in the gift of the
- Scottish Police Authority. At the moment, and this may
- 17 change as the Conduct and Ethics Bill goes through
- Parliament, at the moment if an officer decides to
- 19 resign or retire whilst they are facing misconduct or
- 20 indeed gross misconduct investigation within
- 21 Police Scotland, we can't prevent them from doing that.
- 22 Q. And once they have resigned or retired is there anything
- 23 that Police Scotland can do in terms of assessing
- 24 misconduct, perhaps sanctioning an officer if they are
- 25 found to have acted contrary to their professional

1 standards? So at the moment in Scotland once an officer retires, 2 Α. 3 they are no longer an officer, therefore, they are not 4 subject to Police Scotland discipline in any way, shape 5 or form. Now, if an officer who is facing a criminal 6 7 investigation resigns or retires, then of course that criminal investigation can continue to its ultimate 8 9 conclusion, but when an officer resigns or retires and 10 you know it is -- in policing in Scotland, very often an officer will resign before they are put through any 11 12 conduct process. The conduct process at this point in 13 time falls at that stage. 14 And that's due to change? Q. 15 Α. That may change depending on the legislation which is making its way through Scottish Parliament at the 16 17 moment. 18 Q. But in the situation where they resign or they retire, 19 they are no longer subject to any misconduct 20 proceedings? 21 Α. No. 22 They cannot be sanctioned by Police Scotland and they Q. cannot impose any penalties or anything of that sort? 23 No, that's exactly right and, you know, I don't know 24 Α. where the bill which is currently working its way 25

through parliament where that will end up, but where I am very clear in my mind is that if an officer resigns or retires in advance of facing gross -- particularly gross misconduct investigations, then there should be consideration given to whether that officer should go on what we knew in England and Wales as a "disbarred officers' list", which would bring some sanction into play, counsel.

Now, that that is not an option that's available to us at the moment, but I know it or believe that is something that the bill making its way through parliament is addressing; whether if somebody does resign or retire in advance of facing gross misconduct process, then is it possible to put some kind of sanction on that individual subsequently which means that they wouldn't work in policing at any point in the future.

Q. I believe it's public knowledge that officers may retire in their fifties and then go on to have a second career, we have had a number of witnesses talk about that in this hearing and they may go on and do jobs working in the field of security or some other area. At the moment, there's nothing to prevent them doing that, even if they were subject to quite serious, potentially serious, misconduct proceedings. Could they become PIRC

investigators? 1 2 That's a question for PIRC. Α. All right. But they could have jobs in other areas, 3 Q. 4 including security, including investigations, where they 5 would not be sanctioned as things presently stand today? So again, quite a complex environment. Obviously, 6 Α. 7 the -- whoever an individual officer's new employer would be one would anticipate they would do some vetting 8 9 of their own right. The difficulty of course is that when an officer resigns or retires from Police Scotland, 10 when we are asked about the status of that officer, then 11 12 we will say they have resigned or they have retired so 13 there is a lacuna there, there is no doubt about it. 14 Again, I do draw a distinction between, if you like, 15 statutory agencies, other police agencies, whether that's NCA, the Ministry of Defence, police or the 16 17 police service in England or Wales, as opposed to an 18 officer taking up employment within the private sector. Before you retired, if an officer, a former officer, 19 Q. 20 requested a reference and that officer had been subject 21 to misconduct proceedings, which were brought to a halt 22 by their resignation or their retirement, was it part of the reference that that would be raised with the person 23 seeking the reference? 24 A. So I would need to check that. I think that the 25

1 circumstances would be related simply that the officer had resigned or retired from Police Scotland. I don't 2 3 know whether we would include the fact that they had 4 resigned or retired whilst they were facing misconduct 5 or gross -- I genuinely don't know the answer to that. We can perhaps find that out? 6 Q. 7 Yes, absolutely. Α. It's possible that someone who resigns to avoid the 8 Q. 9 questions being asked in misconduct proceedings, that he could go on or she could go on to have other -- another 10 career and for that not to be something the new 11 12 employers were aware of? 13 Potentially, potentially. As I say, I would need to Α. 14 check the current situation with colleagues in P & D, or 15 HR Department and PSD about how that set of circumstances would be dealt with in 2024 if a request 16 17 for a reference came in regarding an officer who had resigned or retired in those circumstances. 18 19 And if an officer retires in this situation, their Q. 20 pension would be unaffected? 21 Α. So if -- again, if an officer resigns and it's early in 22 their service, then there will be a financial detriment, there is no doubt about that, the police pension 23 wouldn't be paid when it might normally be paid if you 24

retired under the normal scheme of things. If however

1 an officer has reached retirement age and chooses to retire, then you're absolute right, they would 2 3 potentially be able to crystallise their pension with 4 the service that they had at the point at which they 5 retired. And if they are medically retired, does that encompass 6 Q. 7 an enhanced pension taking account of medical reasons? It can encompass an enhanced pension, yes. 8 Α. Right. Let's look at paragraph 18. This is -- on the 9 Q. 10 screen we still have the opinion of Lord Woolman: "On 22 November 2018, the SPA wrote to ask the PIRC 11 12 whether it had found potential grounds of misconduct on 13 the part of the officers." 14 So this was the November prior to this opinion, this 15 opinion was April '19. 16 Α. Yes. This is the proceeding November and it's, as you say, 17 Q. 18 the question of whether the person should be allowed to 19 retire, medically retire, is within the gift of the SPA 20 and they have written to ask PIRC whether it had found 21 potential grounds of misconduct on the part of the 22 officers and the PIRC gave this inquiry short. It replied that it was not part of its role to report on 23 questions of misconduct. 24 25 So certainly in November 2018 it would appear that

1 PIRC, is it fair to say, did not consider questions of misconduct to be part of their role if they were 2 involved in an investigation? 3 4 Α. So again, counsel, I would need to check my recollection 5 of this, but I don't know if PIRC were actually even able to consider misconduct on the part of officers up 6 7 to the rank of Chief Superintendent. I think the conduct space for PIRC was engaged with -- with PIRC 8 9 would potentially be engaged with investigations into 10 chief officers, but, again, that's my recollection. I would need --11 12 Q. I think that may be correct. We have heard evidence 13 about that. Yes, I would need to check that. 14 Α. 15 Q. In terms of even asking, even in 2018, asking PIRC for assistance to consider potential misconduct, it's 16 17 described here as them giving short shrift to that type of request, so unlikely that PIRC would assist at that 18 19 stage or prior to that? A. That seems to be the case. 20 21 And then can we look at paragraph 21: Q. "Here the DCC has not told the officers that they 22 face any proceedings or that any such proceedings have 23 been postponed." 24 I think that's correct, isn't it? 25

1 A. That's my recollection, yes.

Q. And then 27, Lord Woolman asks two questions. Can we go
to just above that, please, just so we can see the
section that we're -- if we can keep going up. This is
to do with the decision on irrationality regarding the
judicial review proceedings, so if we can turn to
paragraph 27, again, please:

"No one has suggested that the officers are culpable to any degree in respect of the incident. The SPA itself relies on an unspecified involvement. One may ask two questions. How could they now be charged, given that they have been questioned at length without being cautioned and how could the DCC institute misconduct proceedings, given the lapse of time and absence of any intimation?"

And I'm interested in the comments by Lord Woolman about, how could the DCC institute misconduct proceedings, given the lapse of time and absence of any intimation. Is that something that you were having regard to when you were considering if you ever considered proceedings under 2014 -- the 2014 Regulations, the delay which is being caused by the involvement of PIRC, the involvement of other matters, the lack of disclosure of the PIRC report, given the lapse of time. I mean we're talking about events in

- 1 2015. This is a decision from 2019, almost four years
- 2 later.
- 3 A. Yes.

10

11

- Q. And the absence of any intimation of misconduct proceedings under the 2014 Regs?
- A. I think there is no disagreement that the length of time
  that these matters have been working through various
  processes is far from satisfactory for the family and,
  you know, that is very, very suboptimal.
  - Q. And certainly with the Regulations it would appear that it's not that they're being worked through, it's that any question or any consideration is being deferred?
- 13 So again, there's the piece that we discussed this Α. 14 morning about having disclosure from the PIRC, 15 understanding from the statements they've taken, from the evidence they've gathered, from, you know, 16 17 everything that they have accrued and distilled from the 18 events in 2015, if there is no criminality, then what 19 does that mean in terms of, you know, let's go through 20 that conduct assessment and then, as you say, the more 21 time that elapses the less satisfactory the 22 circumstances are for all concerned, counsel.
- Q. And can we look at paragraph 31. I'm interested in the part that starts "Specifically, there was no foundation" there in the middle. "Specifically" in brackets, do you

- say that in the middle of the paragraph?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. "(Specifically, there was no foundation for inferring that either officer might be criticised for their
- 5 conduct that day)."
- And that relates to former PC Paton?
- 7 A. Yes.

- Q. And former PC Short. And so the Lord Ordinary took the view there was no foundation for inferring that either officer might even be criticised, never mind any suggestion of misconduct, gross misconduct or criminal proceedings at that stage. Yes. And that will be correct. As I understand it, there was no basis for making that inference.
  - A. At that point in time, that's absolutely correct.
- We talked about the period of time that that has taken 16 Q. 17 and at this stage four years from the date of Mr Bayoh's death. The Inquiry understands that that was in 18 19 April 2019, and then, as I understand the position, in 20 the month after this, there was some contact with the 21 family and they wrote to Iain Livingstone the Chief 22 Constable about this formally asking that criminal complaint be brought to the attention of the Chief 23 Constable and commenting specifically in relation to 24 this opinion and talking about the public perception and 25

1 concerns that they had, wide-ranging concerns about the public perception, criminality, race, issues along those 2 3 lines. And after this decision by Lord Woolman and then in 4 5 light of the letter from the family to the Chief Constable, were you aware at that time as to the extreme 6 7 concerns that were being expressed by the family? So I can't -- I haven't seen that letter, certainly not 8 Α. 9 recently, so I'm unfamiliarity with the content of it or 10 certainly not familiar with the content of it, but I have been aware, counsel, of the family's concerns 11 12 throughout. 13 Right. During that period, say from April 2019 after Q. 14 this decision, May 2019, when the family were in 15 contacts with Chief Constable and the November of that year, so between April and November of 2019, the public 16 17 inquiry was announced in the November, what did Police Scotland do in that period of time after this 18 19 decision from Lord Woolman and prior to the announcement 20 of the public inquiry about making progress in relation 21 to the possible conduct issues under the 2014 Regulations? 22 A. So I would need to go back and refresh my memory, 23 because I don't know what happened with the complaint 24 which came in to which you refer, counsel. I have no --25

- I don't recall what happened to that. The letter would
- 2 have been directed by the Chief Constable --
- 3 Q. We hope to hear from the former Chief Constable. We can
- 4 ask him.
- 5 A. Fine, that's absolutely fine. I -- whilst the public
- 6 inquiry was intimated formally in November 2019 --
- 7 Q. Yes, an announcement was made?
- 8 A. The announcement was made, I think in advance of that
- 9 announcement and, again, I would have to go back and
- just check the dateline here, counsel, I think there was
- 11 intimation to potential core participants that a public
- inquiry was going to be held before that public
- announcement was made, so I think we would have
- 14 understood at some point -- now, again, I can't be
- specific, because I don't have the letters from
- Mr Yousaf, then the Justice Secretary to the Chief
- 17 Constable, in front of me, but I think we were aware
- 18 before November that there would be a public inquiry
- 19 held into the death of Mr Bayoh.
- Q. And how long before?
- 21 A. I can't remember. I can't remember.
- 22 Q. This decision from Lord Woolman was April, the family
- 23 were in touch with the Chief Constable in May, how long
- 24 before November would --
- 25 A. So I genuinely can't remember and of course there are

1 two issues. There are the issues that the family rightly raised about ex-Constables Paton and Short and 2 3 then there is that broader piece around crown and 4 victim's right to review and the other subject officers 5 so I genuinely -- I find it difficult to answer that question, because there were a number of issues in train 6 7 at that point in time. What I would say is the organisation was still very 8 9 seized with the fact that Mr Bayoh had died, there were 10 still gold groups going on, the circumstances were being considered, but I can't remember what happened. I can't 11 12 remember what happened with that letter. 13 Right. And do you remember if any steps were being Q. 14 taken before the announcement about the public inquiry 15 or before you became aware of that in relation to progressing matters under the 2014 Regulations? 16 So I can't remember whether we were requesting PIRC at 17 Α. 18 that point in time or asking PIRC at that specific 19 period post the victim's right to review, as we 20 discussed this morning, whether we could have access to 21 the file or not. I genuinely can't remember. I don't 22 know whether there was enough time to enable that to 23 happen, but, again, I couldn't define that timeline for you this afternoon. 24 Right. Now, in 2020 -- I should say the Inquiry 25 Q.

1 officially commenced on 20 November 2020. 2 Α. Yes. We started to seek documentation at that stage and the 3 Q. 4 first documents we received were the following year, 5 2021. So that was what was happening with the public 6 inquiry. 7 In 2021, on 14 October, volumes 1 and 2 of the PIRC report were disclosed to Police Scotland via the Inquiry 8 9 and on 14 December 2021 volume 3 of the PIRC report was 10 disclosed to Police Scotland via the Inquiry. At the point at which you received disclosure of 11 12 these documents, what steps, if any, did you take in 13 relation to the 2014 Regulations and any assessment to 14 be carried out? 15 So I don't think we did at that stage, counsel. Α. You don't think you got disclosure on those dates? 16 Q. No, no, I think we got disclosure, but I don't think we 17 Α. went back to the 2014 Regs and carried out an 18 19 assessment. Again, if you -- you will be aware that in 20 the run in to a public inquiry, we would be taking as an 21 organisation some significant and, you know, very 22 thoughtful legal advice around what steps we should take, very, very clear that we did not want in any way 23 to undermine the public inquiry, but to the best of my 24 knowledge and recollection over that period -- to the 25

1 best of my knowledge and recollection, over that period there wasn't an assessment carried out on the volumes of 2 3 material that PIRC released to us. Now, I may be wrong, 4 but that's my recollection. 5 Thank you. And then can we look at your Inquiry Q. statement, the relate response. That is SBPI 05046, and 6 7 I would like to look at paragraph 10. It's on the 8 screen: 9 "I made the decision that an undertaking would not 10 be provided to the Inquiry that officers giving evidence would not face conduct proceedings. The rationale for 11 12 my decision is set out in my letter dated 25 March 2022." 13 14 I would like to look at that letter, please, 15 SBPI 00634. And you'll see that this is a letter from Police Scotland to the Chair of the Inquiry and the date 16 17 is actually at the very top of the letter, which 25 March 2002, and a request had been made in relation 18 19 to undertakings. 20 I don't know if you recollect the circumstances. 21 Α. Yes. 22 And you had been requested to provide an undertaking in Q. relation to disciplinary proceedings against individual 23 officers? 24 25 A. Yes.

22

23

24

25

1 Q. Or individual serving officers, because, as I understand the position at this time, both PC Paton and PC Short 2 3 had retired, medically retired? 4 Α. Yes. 5 Of the remaining serving officers who remained within Q. Police Scotland. And I think no undertakings were given 6 7 and I think if we look at page 2 of the letter, please, and in particular paragraph 2, you point out that: 8 9 "It was a matter of consensus that the privilege 10 against self-incrimination does not apply in disciplinary proceedings." 11 12 And I'm interested in this aspect. We've obviously 13 and as part of this process we looked at the privilege 14 against self-incrimination and that was very much a live 15 issue in relation to possible criminal proceedings. 16 Α. Yes. And also in relation to evidence given under oath to the 17 Q. 18 Inquiry. And you've pointed out in your letter that the 19 privilege against self-incrimination doesn't apply in 20 disciplinary proceedings and I'm interested in that 21 aspect of your consideration of misconduct proceedings

and if there is a tension where there's a criminal

the privilege -- to exercise a privilege in that

situation, but not in relation to misconduct

investigation ongoing, but you know they have a right to

1 proceedings? 2 So I think that and, again, you know, I go back and look Α. 3 at the legal advice that I received, counsel, in terms 4 of drafting that letter to the Chair, but my 5 understanding was that case law suggested that there was not a right not to -- I know that's a very clumsy way of 6 7 putting it -- a right not self-incriminate within a discipline environment in the way that there would be 8 within a criminal environment. 9 10 Q. In a criminal environment the officers should be entitled to say "I have the right not to criminate 11 12 myself" and they can rely on that. 13 Yes. Α. 14 "And because of that right I'm going to exercise that Q. 15 right and I'm not going to answer any questions." 16 Α. Yes. And they don't have that right in misconduct 17 Q. 18 proceedings, I think that's what you're saying there? 19 That's my understanding. Again, I would go back and Α. 20 check the legal advice that I received in preparing that 21 letter to come to the Chair. I'm interested in how Police Scotland resolve that issue 22 Q. where you have or you have the possibility of 23 considering misconduct proceedings, you know there are 24 potentially criminal proceedings and there's the right 25

1 not to incriminate oneself, but that doesn't exist in misconduct proceedings. Can you help us understand do 2 3 have regard to the right of privilege against self-incrimination? 4 5 So I think it's also important just to highlight that a Α. number of the officers weren't looking for any 6 7 undertaking from myself, they didn't need an undertaking from myself to, if you like, protect them from any 8 9 possibility of self-incrimination as far as conduct was 10 going, because actually they -- we talked about our standards of professional behaviour earlier, they felt 11 12 that it was -- they felt that it was absolutely the 13 right thing to do to come to this Inquiry and to be 14 absolutely candid with the Inquiry and not require 15 any -- not require any guarantees, if you like, from myself around anything that they may have provided in 16 17 evidence potentially being self-incriminatory as far as any future conduct proceeding is concerned. 18 And in relation to the undertakings, and you declined to 19 Q. 20 provide undertakings, was that because you took the view 21 you may wish to initiate, consider, commence misconduct 22 proceedings against the officers? A. I think that was always -- that was always the case and 23

certainly, again, just reflecting on some of the legal

advice that I think I was provided at the time, very

24

- careful about the issue of privilege obviously.
- 2 Q. Obviously, I don't want to encroach on that.
- 3 A. No, and there is case law in terms of other public
- 4 inquiries, as I recall, which suggest that even if there
- 5 was any comfort given by the discipline authority, as
- 6 opposed to any criminal authority, it would
- 7 predominantly cover simple misconduct as opposed to
- 8 gross misconduct. So there was also that
- 9 differentiation in my mind around simple misconduct and
- 10 gross misconduct, which might ultimately lead to a
- 11 serving officer, if it was proven, losing their job.
- 12 Q. But in terms of your position in 2022 at least, did you
- still take the view that it would have been open to you
- 14 at that stage, regardless of the delay in initiating or
- 15 considering or commencing misconduct proceedings under
- the 2014 Regulations?
- 17 A. At the conclusion of the Inquiry, absolutely.
- 18 Q. The position was you would defer consideration or
- 19 assessment until the conclusion of the Inquiry?
- 20 A. Yes, given that there were two aspects to that, the
- 21 first is the material that was collated by PIRC in the
- 22 context of the PIRC inquiry and then, secondly, there
- 23 would be the issue of the evidence which was provided by
- 24 those officers around the circumstances in May 2015 to
- 25 the Chair of the Inquiry.

1 Q. And at the time you left, at the time you retired, was it -- did it remain your position that consideration of 2 3 proceedings under the 2014 Regulation would be given at 4 the conclusion of this public inquiry? 5 That was my anticipation, yes. As I say, both in terms Α. of the initial incidents back in 2015, but also the 6 7 conduct of the officers over the course of the public inquiry itself, should that become an issue, and I'm not 8 9 suggesting for a minute that it has, but should that 10 become an issue. Q. If you could give me a moment. I'm conscious that we're 11 12 just after 3. 13 LORD BRACADALE: We'll take a 15-minute break. 14 (3.02 pm)15 (A short break) (3.21 am)16 17 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I would like to remain with the 18 19 letter for the moment, 25 March 2022, and I would like 20 to look at page 2 and paragraph 5. Here we are and it 21 starts: 22 "The rights of the bereaved family of Sheku Bayoh are at the centre of the Inquiry. As stated in the 23 submission on behalf of the Chief Constable, their 24 Article 2 rights encompass not only the carrying out of 25

1 thorough, diligent and comprehensive inquiry, but the 2 duty also requires there to be appropriate provision for 3 disciplinary action." 4 And I think you have mentioned earlier that you take 5 the view that in carrying out -- where there has been a death at the hands of the state in this case after 6 7 contact with the police, that Article 2 rights will be engaged and I've asked a number of witnesses about this, 8 9 and you said that as part of carrying out this thorough, 10 diligent and comprehensive inquiry, there is a duty that also requires there to be appropriate provision for 11 12 disciplinary action. And that would be what is the 13 framework at least is in existence in the 2014 14 Regulations? 15 Α. Yes. And I would like to ask you a little bit more about 16 Q. 17 that. We've heard about Article 2 and, as part of the 18 investigation, we've ever heard evidence from PIRC, from 19 Crown Office, from police officers about the 20 investigation that was carried out after Mr Bayoh died. 21 And as part of that picture there is the 2014 Regulations and we're hearing from you in 22 23 connection with that. 24 We've heard that there are five procedural obligations under Article 2 and you may have heard some 25

1 evidence in relation to this, but if I can put it shortly, independence, adequacy, reasonably prompt, 2 3 public scrutiny and next of kin and I would like to just 4 ask you some questions about those five obligations. 5 In relation to the question, first of all, of independence, you've talked -- two things I would like 6 7 to cover in this aspect. First of all, under the Regulations it is a DCC who is responsible for 8 9 considering, assessing, categorising, instigating, 10 commencing possible conduct proceedings. It is a fellow police officer from Police Scotland. Do you have any 11 12 concerns about the question of misconduct and the 13 application of the Regulations to any given situation, 14 do you have any concerns about fellow officers carrying 15 out these tasks in relation to other officers who are also within Police Scotland? 16 So Police Scotland is a very large organisation, some 17 Α. 23,000, I think at last count some 23,000 police 18 officers and police staff, so I do think that there is 19 20 sufficient distance between the officers who will carry 21 out that conduct assessment that we have spoken about 22 this morning who sit within a very specialised team in the department -- in the Professional Standards 23 Department and officers who may be geographically 24 deployed anywhere else across the country. So I think 25

1 the structures and the systems that we have in place are 2 sufficiently robust to ensure that there is proper 3 independence and no unnecessary -- no, unnecessary 4 pressure or influence brought to bear on 5 investigating -- those police officers who investigate 6 other police officers. 7 We have recently and, again, I would need to go back, counsel, and just check my recollection on this, 8 9 but we have recently put further safeguards in place, as 10 I recall, to ensure that there is proper independence and a lack of any, as I say, likelihood of undue 11 12 influence being brought to bear, not just in terms of 13 the investigation into a death like this, but 14 investigations which take place up and down the country 15 on a day-in, day-out basis. Again, counsel, you will have been aware of 16 17 comments, conversations, concerns about officers who 18 have been -- who have been -- who are suspected of 19 committing a domestic abuse offence being investigated 20 by colleagues, the victim if you like, the complainant, 21 therefore, potentially doesn't get the quality of 22 service in terms of the investigation they should get because a suggestion that there's an all boys club, if 23 24 you like. 25 So certainly in Police Scotland we are very, very

1 aware of the optics of having a discrete, an independent Professional Standards Department carrying out these 2 3 conduct assessments and indeed, on occasion, 4 investigation into other officers within Police Scotland. 5 And of course the regulatory framework, as we 6 7 discussed at the moment and we discussed this earlier, means that actually it does fall -- again, the best of 8 9 my recollection -- on police officers to carry forward 10 those misconduct investigations. There isn't another organisation that will do that for us. 11 12 Q. Certainly in terms of the 2014 Regulations, as they 13 apply, we can see that obligations, responsibilities 14 fall on Police Scotland's officers? 15 Α. Yes. 16 I appreciate there's a recognition you want to avoid any Q. potential conflicts, bias of some description. 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. We've also heard Police Scotland is a hierarchical 20 organisation, people feel loyalty to their colleagues, 21 they can be facing very stressful and difficult 22 situations, sometimes on a daily basis, and there may be a sense of collegiality, connections made. On that 23 level, is there any sense that Police Scotland take a 24 protective or a defensive approach when it comes to 25

1 issues of misconduct, gross misconduct? 2 Α. No. You seem -- can you elaborate on that? 3 Q. 4 Α. So I think -- back to the point about having an 5 effective complaints and conduct and discipline system is absolutely fundamental to maintaining and upholding 6 7 public confidence in policing and certainly in my time in Police Scotland, yes, we have got things wrong 8 9 historically, quite clearly we have got things wrong 10 historically, but there have been a number of -- there has been a lot of progress made within the organisation 11 12 in terms of the quality of officers who are in the 13 Professional Standards Department, the training that 14 they get, the understanding they have about their core 15 responsibility to protect public confidence in policing in Scotland, and also their own responsibilities as far 16 17 as our values, fairness, integrity, respect, a 18 commitment to upholding human rights, the code of ethics and indeed the standards of behaviour are concerned. 19 Thank you. And then earlier today you talked about --20 Q. 21 when I was asking you about the Regulations, you talked 22 about a matter in 2022 where there was a PIRC investigation and you talked about collaboration and of 23

sort of working relationship that had developed?

24

25

Α.

Yes.

151

1 Q. I'm interested in your views on that from the 2 perspective of Article 2 and independence, if there's 3 this increased collaboration envisaged when PIRC are 4 carrying out an investigation? So that was not an Article 2 investigation and I do 5 Α. think Article 2 investigations are very different. 6 7 Clearly, if the PIRC were to ask us for something, if they required something of us, then we would do our 8 9 utmost to fulfil and discharge those obligations, but 10 I don't want to speak for the PIRC, I'm sure she will speak for herself, but I do think Article 2 11 12 investigations should be investigated entirely 13 independently by the PIRC. 14 The collaborative approach is if there is an offence 15 or a series of offences committed potentially by a police officer which are not in the Article 2 space, but 16 17 which, for example, require, you know, proper -different premises to be searched, property to show 18 seized, we can support the PIRC to do that, under the 19 20 guidance and auspices of the PIRC and the understanding 21 that the investigation is their investigation, but we 22 can assist in ensuring that is carried out. You spoke about, you know, the benefits of a prompt 23 investigation. There are occasions where we can support 24 the PIRC to deliver those, but that is not in the 25

Article 2 space. 1 Sticking with Article 2 matters --2 Q. 3 Α. Yes. -- which give rise to a requirement that there be an 4 Q. 5 Article 2 compliant investigation, so sticking within that and that alone, where misconduct issues fall within 6 7 that, within the wider Article 2 incident, for example, do you think in that situation that it should be the 8 9 role of an independent body of some description to deal with issues of conduct as well as maybe the wider 10 criminal investigation? 11 12 Α. I certainly have no issues with that approach. So I 13 have no issues with that approach in its -- in and of 14 itself own right. However, I would go back to -- and 15 it's important -- this is so important in terms of maintaining public confidence, but, again, what I would 16 17 go back to is, you know, the competence of and the independence of the teams who investigate or carry 18 forward conduct investigations within the Professional 19 20 Standards Department. I have absolutely no concerns 21 about their impartiality or their independence. 22 If in the context of an Article 2 investigation, and of course this is a conversation to have with the PIRC 23 or potentially Scottish Government, could there be seen 24 to be benefit in having a wholly independent assessment 25

1 of any conduct which might come out of that inquiry, I would certainly -- I would not be averse to that 2 3 happening. My consideration would be, given that this 4 is potentially a conduct investigation following the 5 gravest, the gravest set of circumstances that could ever happen when somebody has lost their life, the 6 7 assurance that I would want is whoever is carrying out that conduct investigation is properly trained, is 8 9 skilled, is equipped and is experienced to do that so 10 that there isn't a suboptimal outcome at the end of it, particularly for the family, but also of course for the 11 12 officers as well and then, by definition, public 13 confidence. And you think if there was an independent consideration, 14 Q. 15 an independent body, say, who considered all the Regulations and considered all the issues under the 16 17 Regulations that that independence would enhance public confidence? 18 19 I think independence -- I mean -- you described the five Α. 20 facets of an Article 2-compliant investigation, counsel. 21 From my perspective, you know, the more independence 22 that can be brought into that environment, I can't find -- I wouldn't want to argue with that. 23 My concern would be that whoever -- PIRC are skilled 24 investigators. We would need to -- if it were to be 25

1 PIRC and I need to be absolutely certain that those 2 individuals tasked with any consequent misconduct 3 investigation were as skilled in that environment. 4 Q. And if they were that skilled you would have no 5 objection to that? A. It's about the best outcome for the family of the 6 7 deceased, it's about upholding public confidence, and of course there is also the fact that we would not want 8 9 officers to be then challenging the conduct process, 10 which is back to my point about, you know, skilled, experienced and well -- whoever does it, skilled, 11 12 experienced and well trained. 13 Although the possibility of a challenge exists even for Q. 14 Professional Standards Department --15 Α. Of course it does. -- officers. 16 Q. 17 In relation to the second procedural obligation under Article 2, that relates to the adequacy of the 18 investigation. Now, given what you've explained to us 19 20 today about the issues under the Regulations being 21 deferred at various stages for various reasons and

25 Regulations, was going to be adequate, if there was

22

23

24

potentially until the end of this Inquiry. With regard

to adequacy, can you help me understand how you took the

view that this aspect of Article 2, the aspect of the

1 simply no assessment and no consideration being given? So my -- I mean, as I mentioned we have had a -- this 2 Α. 3 isn't about no kind of regard for the circumstance. You 4 know, we have had a gold group, as I have explained to 5 you, set up for years now with that overview of the circumstances of all of the different elements that have 6 7 led us to the public inquiry. My overarching ambition, however, was that the 8 criminal proceedings -- that all of the circumstances 9 10 around the criminal proceedings, crown's consideration, all of those, you know, really significant issues which 11 12 have to properly be carried forward when there is a 13 death at the hands of the state, a death in police 14 custody or a death following police contact, those are 15 all able to run forward and to reach a conclusion and that took some time as we know. The adequacy of any 16 17 sort of conduct Regulations in terms of any conduct that may or may not arise as a consequence of the 18 19 circumstances in 2015, I do think it's appropriate, as I 20 say, that the criminal investigation is allowed to 21 complete and now the public inquiry is allowed to 22 complete. At the end of that public inquiry, counsel, we will 23 then have a -- we will then have a, you know, an 24 understanding of the entirety of the landscape that 25

1 pertains to the events of 2015.

2

3

4

5

6

7

22

23

24

25

- Q. And in terms of adequacy, obviously the Regulations will, on what you have said, I appreciate you're now retired, but you'll consider matters -- Police Scotland will consider matters under Regulations potentially up to 9 or ten -- well, it's already nine, perhaps ten years after the event?
- So I think that's right. I think a lot of that timeline 8 Α. 9 is absolutely outside of the gift of Police Scotland. 10 That has been as a consequence of the way matters have unfolded since 2015, highly regrettable I think, but I'm 11 12 also very conscious that had we, for argument's sake, 13 been engaged with disciplinary procedures or conduct 14 procedures with the subject officers at the same time as 15 they were being called to a public inquiry to give evidence to the Chair, then I think that could actually 16 17 have had a deleterious impact on the quality of the 18 evidence that they provided to the public inquiry, which 19 I think is incredibly important to support Mr Bayoh's 20 family understanding the truth in the entirety of the 21 events of May 2015.
  - Q. So certainly from the moment in time that the announcement was made about the public inquiry that could be one factor, that would be from 2019. Prior to the public inquiry being announced, what were your

1 concerns about conducting contemporaneous parallel misconduct proceedings between 2015 and 2019? 2 So again, I think we go back to, and please do correct 3 Α. 4 me if I'm wrong here, counsel, the fact that PIRC had 5 carried out that contemporaneous investigation. We talk about the adequacy of any investigation into a death, 6 7 but also the adequacy of any further or follow-on conduct procedures. We hadn't had disclosure of that 8 9 contemporaneous material from the PIRC. We didn't get 10 that until a relatively recently, as you know. I do think it's suboptimal to go back and to try to take 11 12 statements, as I you have rightly said, some five, six 13 years after a series of events and try to work through a 14 misconduct process based on those. I do think that 15 would undermine the adequacy and the professionalism of any conduct investigation. So I think there are a 16 17 series of -- just in terms of the timeline around all of these events there have been a series of issues, 18 19 decisions taken, you know, by a number of actors that 20 mean that there have not been discipline proceedings 21 taken forward to date. 22 As I said to you just before the break, and it's quite clear from the letter that I sent on behalf of the 23 Deputy Chief Constable to the Chair of the Inquiry, we 24

are not ruling anything out at the conclusion of the

25

- 1 Inquiry or indeed at any point beyond that. Your point about timeline, again I'll come back to this, is 2 3 absolutely correct, but that timeline does not 4 necessarily sit within the gift of Police Scotland. 5 The third procedural obligation is that the Q. investigation should be reasonably prompt. Would you 6 7 agree that taking up to nine, ten years is not what one could consider reasonably prompt? 8 Without a shadow of a doubt. 9 Α. 10 Q. Yes. Looking at matters now as they have panned out over this period of time, do you think there are ways 11 12 that Police Scotland could have dealt with the conduct 13 Regulations more efficiently, more quickly than has actually proved to be the case? 14 15 So again I think -- so I think we're going back, Α.
- certainly from my perspective, to part of the 16 17 conversation we had this morning, which is the 18 preeminence of the independent Article 2 investigation, the determinations that might be made by senior 19 20 Crown Counsel about whether there should be potentially 21 any criminality or any charges brought in terms of any 22 of the officers. I think conduct is very much in the foothills of that. I think, you know, the criminality, 23 potential criminality, you know, whether or not crown 24 determine that there is criminality, the potential for 25

- that criminality should take precedence, so we are

  talking about a relatively sort of small period. From

  my perspective, very, very difficult for the family and

  I absolutely empathise with that, but, again, over that

  period, there were a number of issues in terms of access

  to documentation and the like that was not -- that just

  were not available to us.
  - Q. Do you -- in your experience as a DCC, have you come across any other situation where officers have waited over nine years before proceedings are considered under the 2014 Regulations?
  - A. So I don't think I -- well, so I guess there are two issues there, Chair, in terms of a set of circumstances occurring and us being aware of those circumstances, then, no, I think this is quite unique. You know, colleagues will be aware of the fatal accident inquiry into the, you know -- recently resulted in terms of the M9. Again, that was around about 2015.

Of course there are issues where there are historic allegations made against police officers that, you know, suggest that they may have offended before they joined the police service and those don't come to light until a number years later, potentially, and will then go throughout the criminal and conduct processes. So that timeline is not -- the circumstances surrounding, and

you said it yourself, the circumstances surrounding the

death of Mr Bayoh and the subsequent processes and

procedures which have taken place, including the public

inquiry, are quite unique and the timeline from my

perspective is quite unique.

I am aware of circumstances in England and Wales where young black men have died in police custody at the hands of police officers and, again, those proceedings have been incredibly protracted, both for the families of the young men, and they are predominantly young men and they are predominantly young black men, who have died in police custody and, ultimately, an outcome either for the families concerned or indeed the officers concerned.

- Q. For officers who have waited perhaps nine, potentially ten years, they may be looking at reaching retiral age.

  For those officers, as the law presently stands, if they retire or leave the service, there will never be any misconduct proceedings instigated under any circumstances against them?
- A. So that's absolutely correct, counsel. Again, as we discussed this morning, let's assume that we are in an environment where potentially misconduct -- a misconduct investigation is extant, that would not stop and this is not saying that there is any conduct found against any

not the case.

6

19

- officers, but even if a conduct investigation was
  ongoing, that would not -- that would not prevent
  officers, as we discussed this morning, resigning or
  retiring in any effect, but that is not to say that I am
  comfortable or content with the timeline because that is
- Q. And if at the end of this Inquiry time is taken to

  prepare the report, as it obviously will need to be, and

  at the end when the report is published and the findings

  made known, if at that stage the crown then take a view

  that they wish to reflect on issues of criminality once

  more, would Police Scotland wait a further period until

  that assessment had been finished by the crown?
- 14 A. That's not a decision that would be taken by myself,
  15 counsel.
- Q. No. Was that something that you were anticipating, that additional delay, depending on what the crown's view would be?
  - A. I hadn't actually got to that stage in my thinking.
- Q. Right, okay. So the next procedural obligation under
  Article 2 is public scrutiny. Now, we're hoping to hear
  from Lady Angiolini later in this hearing and I wondered
  about whether you consider that there is sufficient
  public scrutiny embodied within these Regulations and I
  think, as I understand we may hear, that Lady Angiolini

1 has made a recommendation about gross misconduct 2 hearings should be in public. And I wonder whether that 3 was something that you were considering before you left? 4 Α. So again, when I was a Deputy Assistant Commissioner in 5 the Metropolitan Police Service, that was at a point in time where police regulation changed in England and 6 7 Wales and I was actually responsible for introducing gross misconduct hearings in public into the 8 9 Metropolitan Police Service, all of which, you know, was 10 done in England and Wales, similarly to Scotland, with the view of enhancing public confidence, trying to, if 11 12 you like, do away with the veil of secrecy, particularly 13 around gross misconduct hearings. 14 My experience in the Met was that actually unless 15 the hearing was particularly iconic or something that -now, this I have to say was when I was a DAC in the Met, 16 17 which was up to 2017. The approach that the 18 Metropolitan Police Service has taken more recently to 19 their conduct processes has obviously changed since the 20 time I was in the Metropolitan Police Service. However, 21 what we found was that bringing gross misconduct 22 hearings in pubic into the Met didn't actually engender an awful lot of public interest, unless it was a 23 particularly iconic gross misconduct hearing, so I have 24 absolutely -- providing -- providing that we can get the 25

1 proper safeguards in place for witnesses, particularly those witnesses in gross misconduct hearings who may be 2 3 complainants, and particularly given that a significant 4 number of the gross misconduct investigations which are 5 ongoing in Police Scotland at the moment involve abuse 6 of authority or abuse of power, power imbalance in some 7 shape or form, it's absolutely -- it's absolutely fundamental that if we do hold gross misconduct hearings 8 9 in public, which as I say I have no inherent 10 disinclination to do, we provide the safeguards to those who are going to come and provide testimony, witness 11 12 evidence, which potentially might mean that a subject 13 officer is found guilty of gross misconduct and loses 14 their job that we provide them with the environment 15 where they feel safe and secure and confident and competent to do that, because actually I think it's a 16 17 bit of an own goal if we're holding gross misconduct 18 hearings in public, but we don't have that support for 19 the key witnesses who we need to come and give evidence 20 in order for the hearing to function appropriately. 21 And in terms of the Regulations, we've touched upon in Q. 22 your evidence the involvement of the next of kin. We've talked about, but at the moment thinking about public 23 scrutiny, obviously, next of kin are members of the 24 public, to what extent do you feel, looking at these 25

1 Regulations and knowing them as you do, do you feel that there was sufficient opportunity for the public to 2 3 question, challenge, the family to question or challenge 4 decisions that were taken in terms of the Regulations or 5 where decisions are not being taken in terms of the 6 Regulations? 7 Α. So I mean I do think there is a lack of transparency around the conduct Regulations in Scotland at the 8 9 moment. I also think the 2014 Regulations, it's 10 personal view from a retired police officer, the 2014 Regulations are better drafted than the 2013 11 12 Regulations, which were drafted obviously to coincide 13 with the inception of Police Scotland. However, at the 14 moment, the issue for me is sort of confidentiality and 15 the technicality around those Regulations, counsel, and to make them more accessible to help members of the 16 17 public, family members, to understand how the process 18 works, I think that can only be -- only be a good thing. 19 Again, what we have done recently in Scotland is 20 publish the outcomes of gross misconduct hearings. Now, 21 we haven't waited for any regulatory framework to enable us to do that. We have waited until the process is 22 concluded. We have then anonymised the outcomes in 23 terms of the officers they refer to, but we have put 24 into policing and into the -- now, I don't know whether 25

24

25

1 they are forward facing on the Police Scotland website, but what we have done is made -- is attempted to be much 2 3 more transparent around gross misconduct outcomes in 4 order that colleagues can learn from those. 5 Right. And then finally, the final procedural Q. obligation is in relation to involving the next of kin. 6 7 And I have asked you a couple of times about whether approaches had been made to the family to find out what 8 9 their views were. You mentioned at one point you 10 thought it was appropriate that the lawyers perhaps be 11 approached. 12 Again, thinking very much about an Article 2 13 scenario, do you think looking at the Regulations that 14 there would perhaps be more opportunities for the next 15 of kin's views to be considered by Police Scotland, maybe on a more formal basis? 16 I think on a formal basis, yes, because goodness knows 17 Α. in circumstances such as these, you know, people will be 18 19 properly emotional, absolutely enveloped, if you like, 20 by the tragedy which has overtaken them, so, yes, I 21 certainly think there is opportunity for the legal 22 advisors of, you know, bereaved families to put the -and back to let in a second -- but the legal advisors of 23

bereaved families to put the concerns, the feelings, the

desires of the family forward. And in fact, I think the

1		letter that we have discussed a couple of times this
2		afternoon in terms of requests for undertakings actually
3		does reference the views of the family through
4		Ms Mitchell.
5	Q.	Yes, yes.
6	Α.	Now, again, how that happens in practice in terms of the
7		regulatory framework would obviously have to be worked
8		through.
9	Q.	Yes. I would like to move on away from Article 2 to
10		some extent. We have heard evidence about Article 14,
11		which is triggered in conjunction with Article 2, and I
12		would like to talk to you about the issue of race.
13		Obviously when I spoke to you this morning, we look
14		at the standards, we looked at equality and diversity
15		and I specifically asked you if that included issues of
16		racial discrimination, which you confirmed it would. So
17		we know that that aspect of the standards of
18		professional behaviour is very much part of what is
19		Schedule 1 of the Regulations.
20		And could we look at paragraph 6 of your Inquiry
21		statement. I think you've said at the very end of that
22		paragraph and it sums it up:
23		"Police Scotland had a zero tolerance approach to
24		racist behaviour."
25		Now, that's very straightforward and then if we

1 could look at page 3 of the letter that we were looking at earlier, this is the letter to the Chair, from 2 3 March 2002, and if we can look at page 3 of that --4 sorry, page 3 and I'm interested in paragraph 3: "The Chief Constable has made it clear that racism 5 or discrimination of any kind is deplorable and 6 completely unacceptable. It should have no place in 7 society and it has no place in policing. Any perceived 8 9 failure to further the policy of zero tolerance within 10 Police Scotland of racist views or discriminatory attitudes would seriously undermine the confidence of 11 12 every community in Police Scotland. It would be highly 13 damaging to the integrity of the service and the rigger 14 with which that policy of zero tolerance is discharged 15 between and among police officers and members of police staff. It would be antithetical to Police Scotland's 16 17 values of integrity, fairness and respect and contrary to our commitment reflected in the police officer's 18 19 declaration to upholding human rights and a shared 20 mission to keep people safe." 21 I'm not sure I said that right, but anyway. 22 You did. Α. Q. We have also heard in the opening statement from the 23 Chief Constable that Police Scotland wish to be 24 antiracist. So these are very strong public statements 25

1		made by and on behalf of Police Scotland and you
2		indicated in opening statement through counsel that:
3		"Holders of the public office of Constable are
4		subject a strict regulatory framework, which is
5		essential for the preservation of public confidence."
6		And you also said:
7		"A rigorous adherence to legal duties will be
8		continually assessed and evaluated for effect."
9		So again, very strong public comments about racial
10		discrimination and how it's not acceptable to
11		Police Scotland. Now, we have heard evidence about
12		Article 14 and the impact of Article 14 in relation to
13		PIRC and Crown Office. And we have heard and it's
14		witnesses have agreed that as part of the obligations
15		under Article 14 that you must take all reasonable steps
16		to unmask any racist motive, so racial motivation is a
17		thing that has to be rooted out?
18	Α.	Absolutely.
19	Q.	And that that aspect of any investigation of an
20		Article 2 investigation must be pursued with vigour, and
21		we've compared that description of Article 14 and the
22		obligations of that in conjunction with Article 2 with
23		the actions taken by PIRC and Crown Office and I would
24		like to ask you, if you use if you take that
25		statement of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 2

1

from me, how you consider Police Scotland's approach to 2 the 2014 Regulations may or may not comply with the Article 14 obligations? 3 4 Α. So again -- I mean, again, I think when the events of 5 2015 occurred, the issue of, you know, was race a factor in the death of Mr Bayoh should absolutely have been 6 7 part of the considerations going forward at the time the incident -- the incident and tragic set of consequences 8 from that incident occurred. 9 10 Q. So race should have been part of the investigation, if it was to be Article 2 and Article 14 compliant? 11 12 Α. That's my -- again, I'm speaking -- I wasn't in 13 Police Scotland at the time, but that would be my view that --14 15 That was the position then and it would have continued Q. 16 to be the position throughout the period to now? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. And we know under the 2014 Regulations that racial 19 discrimination is a feature. It's something that if 20 that exists it would run foul of the Schedule 1 21 standards of professional behaviour. In what way have 22 Police Scotland -- insofar as they have control over these Regulations and the issue of misconduct, in what 23 way have Police Scotland taken all reasonable steps to 24 25 unmask any racist motive or to pursue these issues with

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

vigour, given what you've said that no consideration
will be given until the end of the Inquiry or perhaps
beyond?

A. So again, counsel, from my perspective, given that
the Inquiry's terms of reference talk about, you know

the Inquiry's terms of reference talk about, you know, was race a factor, I would not want anything -- we can go back over the availability of documentation, the timeline and the like that we have already discussed and described. Given the terms of reference of the public inquiry itself, we certainly would not want to cut across those. What we doing within Police Scotland is absolutely looking at what it means, and this is learning for us already and commitment for us already out of the public inquiry, leave the subject officers within the public inquiry to one side for the moment, but certainly the learning for us to date from the public inquiry and also from the work that we have done under the auspices of Policing Together and the EDI, the Equality Diversion and Inclusion Strategy, within Police Scotland tells us very clearly that there is work to be done for us organisationally to become a truly anti-racist organisation, to understand what that means and to integrate our determination to become an anti-racist organisation into every element of policing activity.

1 Now, I don't think that was the case in 2015, I wasn't here. Certainly the work that I have done or 2 3 the work that I did in my tenure in Police Scotland very 4 much focused on how do we become a different 5 organisation, a better organisation, an organisation which actually understands what it means to be 6 7 antiracist, and what that then means in terms of the discharge of those powers and responsibilities that are 8 9 vested within police -- within police officers and also what that means in terms of the culture within the 10 organisation to ensure that it nurtures, supports, 11 12 values and progresses every single individual police 13 officer or member of police staff within the 14 organisation. 15 Q. And talking about learning from the Inquiry, you have said to us earlier today that you were really in charge 16 17 of liaison with the Inquiry and handling the Inquiry, and I don't wish to explore any matters that may be 18 privileged or confidential, but would you be able to 19 20 share with us the process which you have adopted to 21 learn from things that come out during this Inquiry? 22 Certainly. I think I'm looking at the Police Scotland Α. legal team as I speak, counsel, but we --23 I don't want to encroach on anything that may be 24 Q. privileged. I don't believe this will. 25

1 Α. No, that process, and that was one of kind of the key responsibilities which I felt I had was to learn and to 2 3 assist the organisation to learn from the public 4 inquiry. 5 Now, I think there may be a colleague called to talk about organisational learning at some point, counsel, 6 7 but, yes, certainly we can explain in some detail, because there was a significant amount of work ongoing 8 9 in my tenure in Police Scotland that resulted in changes 10 and upgrades to policies and practices, particularly those which were engaged around or which were engaged 11 12 around 2015 and which have subsequently, as I say, been 13 upgraded and improved. That is fundamental learning for 14 us from the Inquiry and very happy to share that to 15 date, from the Inquiry to date, very happy to share that 16 with you. Thank you. And am I right in thinking that notes have 17 Q. been taken during the course of the Inquiry and 18 improvements have been made on an ongoing basis and 19 20 Police Scotland have not simply waited in terms of 21 making improvements until the end of Inquiry? 22 I think that's right absolute right and if we were to Α. look specifically, for example, at family liaison 23 officer and how a family liaison officer is trained, how 24 they're deployed, their understanding of cross-cultural 25

1 communication, how they might engage with a member of a black or minority ethnic community who has lost a loved 2 3 one, whatever circumstances, those policies have been 4 actively worked upon over the course of the Inquiry. 5 That's just one example. The operational safety training, as I think you have 6 7 heard, is constantly being upgraded, as is the Scottish police emergency life saving training as well. So there 8 9 are a number of different policies, practices and 10 procedures which are being reviewed over the course of the Inquiry. 11 12 What I would add to that is that one of the elements 13 of the Equality, Diversion and Inclusion Strategy which 14 was given effect in Police Scotland or given effect to 15 in Police Scotland, I think it was in early 2022, talks about us constantly going back and reviewing policies, 16 17 practices and procedures to ensure that they are antiracist and that they do not unwittingly discriminate 18 19 against anybody who is from a different minority ethnic 20 or black background and indeed that also refers to 21 other, you know, people with other protected characteristics as well. 22 Q. Thank you. I would like to go back to one thing. I 23

Q. Thank you. I would like to go back to one thing. I asked you previously about disclosure of the PIRC report?

24

25

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	And when that took place and what steps, if any, had
3		been taken after that. And it may be that if I ask you
4		about this it will prompt a memory with you. Although
5		much disclosure is given by the Inquiry, there is
6		something known as a restriction order which precludes
7		that information being disseminated publicly. Did you
8		take a view that that restriction order would interfere
9		in any way with your obligations under the Regulations?
10	Α.	I genuinely don't know. I can't answer that.
11	Q.	That's fine. Now, we've talked about the gold group and
12		I would like to move on to that.
13		Let's look at your Inquiry statement and if we could
14		look at paragraph 8, please:
15		"This gold group had been formed prior to my
16		appointment to Police Scotland. It was concerned with
17		issues including community engagement; the overview of
18		ongoing legal matters; overview of any internal
19		investigations and processes; situational awareness of
20		ongoing media coverage; and the welfare of the officers
21		involved."
22		That seems to be a broad remit for a group. So we
23		have heard about other gold group meetings that took
24		place at a very early stage after 3 May 2015. Is this a
25		different type of gold group?

1 Α. Yes, it is. The reason we still had gold group and that 2 gold group matured and evolved again, counsel, with 3 the -- as we understood that there would be a public 4 inquiry in order that we could, as Police Scotland, 5 commit to the Chief Constable's -- the then Chief Constable's aspiration to be as supportive and 6 7 transparent with the public inquiry as Police Scotland possibly could be as a core participant, but that was 8 9 not a -- so that was not a critical incident gold group 10 if you like. This was a gold group which was still set up which 11 12 clearly had come about as a consequence to -- as 13 a consequence of a critical incident, but we were now some number of years on, so this was really to ensure 14 15 that we still had and we mentioned this earlier today that Police Scotland was still well aware and it was not 16 17 forgetting, at the highest levels within the organisation, of the events of May 2015. 18 19 Although the reference in your statement seems to Q. 20 suggest this was a very large remit, is this all to do 21 with the death of Mr Bayoh? 22 Yes, it was. Yes, it was. Now, as I say that -- the Α. gold group its terms of reference were expanded when we 23 knew that the public inquiry was going to take place, 24 25 but this was to do -- because we knew at some point we

- were either going to get the material back from the

  PIRC, there was going to be an assessment carried out or

  there was going to be a fatal accident inquiry or indeed

  a public inquiry, so it was very important that we

  maintained that overview from a Police Scotland

  perspective of the events and the circumstances of 2015.
  - Q. When earlier I was asking about public concern and how that was being weighed and assessed and considered, and you talked about the group engaging with community engagement, this was done through this gold group?
  - A. So the gold group took the product in. The engagement would be done locally, as we said earlier, either by the divisional commander on the -- in -- responsible for the division that the event occurred in, but also we have a or certainly we had at the point in time when I was in Police Scotland a Preventions and Community Well-being Division as well, which would take a broader look across the country at any issues around community cohesion or community engagements, so locally and nationally, and the product fed into the gold group, which would enable me, if I wasn't happy with the product, to go back and ask for a bit more detail or a better understanding of what might be happening, you know, in Kirkcaldy or other parts of Fife, for example.
  - Q. And you were the Chair of the gold group?

- 1 A. I took responsibility on to become the Chair of the gold group when I moved into the organisation, yes.
  - Q. Who's involved in the gold group?

3

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4 So it was an iterative process, as I say, the gold group Α. 5 and when I took it on to -- when I passed the Chair over to ACC now DCC Spiers when my responsibilities and 6 7 portfolio changed. If we talk most recently, counsel, about that gold group, it would involve my deputy, 8 9 ACC Spiers then, who's responsible for ensuring that 10 sort of tactically we were preparing properly for the public inquiry. It would involve and did involve the 11 12 ACC who was local to the division in which the events of 13 2015 had occurred and, again, to ensure that the 14 community cohesion, community tension, any issues that 15 might be arising on that division, we had proper -- we had a proper oversight of and understanding of. 16

There would also be legal representation on that group to ensure that actually we were getting the proper advice and ensuring that any decisions that were taken were appropriate and lawful, and equally, just simply because of the length of time, and we have alluded to this already, that the gold group had been running for and the time that the various investigative process had been running for just to ensure that there was a consistency in approach throughout.

1 We would have colleagues from corporate communications sitting within that group as well and 2 3 very latterly we would have -- just look to have an 4 understanding of finance and costs around the various 5 different processes and inquiries that were ongoing. Thank you. Then can we look at paragraph 3 and you talk 6 Q. 7 about, as she was then, Dame Angiolini's Independent Complaints Review in 2020 and you say paragraph 3: 8 9 "I set up the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion 10 (EDI) oversight board in March 21 to bring together internal and external aspects of new and ongoing 11 12 activity to counter discrimination and to focus on the issues of equality, diversity and inclusion." 13 14 And it says: 15 "The oversight board consisted of chief officers from across Police Scotland, as well as external 16 17 interested parties: HMICS; the Scottish Police Authority, members of the independent review group that 18 had been created following the Dame Elish Angiolini 19 20 independent complaints review in 2020; statutory and 21 non-statutory staff organisations; colleagues from People & Development (P&D); colleagues from PPCW, which 22 was tasked with coordinating community facing EDI 23 activity; the National Police Chiefs' Council chief 24 officer responsible for creation of the England & Wales 25

1 Race Action Plan was also invited to attend so we could learn and share good practice with colleagues and home 2 3 office forces." 4 So the oversight board, am I right in saying that 5 arose out of the Dame Elish Angiolini's complaints review in 2020? 6 7 Α. No. Oh, no? 8 Q. No. 9 Α. 10 Q. Right. So the EDI oversight board we set up because the 11 Α. 12 chief -- one of the key tasks that the then chief 13 constable gave me, counsel, was to enhance 14 organisationally our understanding of race and diversity 15 inclusion matters and also to address a number of issues which were extant in Police Scotland at that time. So 16 17 there were almost two train tracks running in parallel. Dame Elish was carrying out her investigation and at the 18 same time I was in Police Scotland striving to 19 20 understand what the culture of the organisation was and 21 one of the ways I did that was by speaking to numbers of 22 black and minority ethnic colleagues who started to give me an understanding of how the organisation felt for 23 them and that was one of the key drivers of setting the 24 EDI board up. One of the other key drivers was that 25

1 actually at that point in time, and no disrespect whatsoever to my predecessors, I felt that EDI activity 2 3 was scattered about the organisation and wasn't actually 4 as coherent as it could be and as a consequence of that 5 wasn't likely to deliver the effect that I felt needed to be delivered across the organisation in order to 6 7 ensure that we could actually impact positively on the culture of Police Scotland so the -- when Dame Elish 8 9 provided her sort of recommendations, actually the 10 recommendations around the experiences of black and minority ethnic colleagues were absolutely aligned to 11 12 what I had been told directly by black and minority 13 ethnic colleagues in the focus groups that we had set up 14 precursor activity to the EDI board which obviously then 15 became the Policing Together oversight board, so as I say, there were a number of activities running in 16 17 parallel in Police Scotland at that point in time. So a number of parallel activities in relation to this 18 Q. 19 issue of EDI, as a result of that, as a result of 20 Dame Elish's report in 2020, a number of factors came 21 together and culminated in the setting up of the 22 oversight board --23 Α. Yes. Q. -- in March 2021? 24 25 Α. That's absolutely correct, and you'll see from the

1	number of individuals who were invited to attend that
2	board, it was a really significant strategic board
3	within Police Scotland at that time and reported into
4	the preeminent senior leadership board on a monthly
5	basis through myself giving an update on EDI activity in
6	the organisation.
7	Q. Thank you. I'm conscious it's now quarter past 4, would
8	that be an appropriate time?
9	THE ARBITRATOR: Yes, we will stop there and we will
10	continue with your evidence tomorrow morning at
11	10 o'clock, Ms Taylor.
12	(4.14 pm)
13	(The hearing was adjourned to 10 am on Thursday 20 June
14	2024)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX
2	1Evidence of MS FIONA TAYLOR (affirmed)
3	Examination-in-chief by MS GRAHAME1
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	