Tuesday, 1 October 2024. 1 2 (10.00am)3 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning and welcome to this hearing in the Sheku Bayoh Inquiry. Today the Inquiry will take 4 5 evidence from Mr Anwar, solicitor for the families of Sheku Bayoh. In the rest of this hearing, the Inquiry 6 7 will hear evidence relating to certain aspects of 8 training. 9 Good morning, Mr Anwar, will you take the oath. THE WITNESS: Yes, my Lord. 10 11 AAMER ANWAR (sworn) 12 Examination-in-chief by MS THOMSON LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson? 13 14 MS GRAHAME: Good morning. 15 A. Good morning, Ms Thomson. 16 Q. You are Aamer Anwar? 17 A. Yes. Q. How old are you, Mr Anwar? 18 56. 19 Α. 20 Are you a solicitor? Q. 21 Α. Yes. I believe that you started your traineeship in 2000, 22 Q. which means you would have qualified in 2002? 23 24 A. That's right. Q. You're the principal solicitor at Aamer Anwar & Co 25

- 1 solicitors in Glasgow?
- 2 A. That's right.
- Q. And you represent the families of Sheku Bayoh?
- 4 A. That's right.
- 5 Q. You have done so since 4 May 2015?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 Q. Can I invite you to open up the blue folder in front of
- 8 you. There are a number of documents in here that you
- 9 can refer to at any time during your evidence if you
- 10 would find that to be helpful. Firstly, there should be
- 11 within the folder a Rule 8 request issued by the Inquiry
- on 19 January 2024. That has the reference number
- SBPI 00468. I don't think we need that on the screen,
- 14 but if you could confirm that we have that in the folder
- 15 for you --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. -- Mr Anwar? There should also be your response of
- 18 2 February 2024. That's SBPI 00453.
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And again, we don't need that on the screen just now,
- 21 but may I ask you in responding to the questions that
- you were asked in the Rule 8 request, did you do your
- 23 best to answer those questions truthfully and accurately
- in your response?
- 25 A. Yes, I did.

1 Q. The next document we will put up on the screen, please, and that's a statement that you gave to the Inquiry. 2 3 That's SBPI 00549 and if we scroll down a little, we'll 4 see that this is your statement and that it was taken on 5 19 and 20 March of this year and if we could perhaps go to the very end of the document, we'll see that it was 6 7 signed by you on 26 April of this year. Your signature has been redacted, but hopefully your signature will 8 appear on the copy in front of you? 9 10 Α. Yes. Paragraph 50, sorry 250, reads: 11 Q. 12 "I believe the facts stated in this witness 13 statement are true. I understand that the statement may 14 form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be 15 published on the Inquiry's website." So you gave your statement knowing that it would 16 17 form evidence before the Chair, that it would be 18 published open website? 19 Α. Yes. And did you do your best to answer the questions that 20 Q. 21 were asked of you truthfully and accurately? 22 Α. I did. Mr Anwar, you have sought the Chair's permission to 23 Q. address Sheku Bayoh's families and that permission has 24 25 been granted. Would you like to address his families

1		now?
2	Α.	Thank you, Ms Thomson. I'm grateful to you, Chair, for
3		granting that permission.
4		I'm grateful to the Chair for giving me the
5		opportunity to say a few words directly to the loved
6		ones of Sheku Bayoh, some of whom are here today and
7		others who find it too painful to come. Sheku should
8		have celebrated his 41st birthday yesterday, but at the
9		age of 31 he left behind two young sons; a loving
10		partner, Collette; three sisters, Kadi, Adama and Kosna
11		his mother, Aminata; as well as his brother-in-law Ade,
12		who loved Sheku as a younger brother.
13		In the midst of their grief, Sheku's family were
14		forced to set up a campaign simply to get to the truth.
15		They never wanted the glare of a media spotlight, but
16		were given no choice because of the failure of the most
17		powerful institutions in our country to do their public
18		duty. Since May 2015 you have met with two
19		First Ministers, three Lord Advocates, three Solicitor
20		Generals, four Senior Crown Counsel, one PIRC
21		Commissioner, two Chief Constables, three Deputy Chief
22		Constables and three Justice Ministers. Each and every
23		one of those individuals has paid tribute to you for
24		your tenacity, for your courage, for your dignity and

your perseverance, whilst asking your family to place

25

their trust in them, but so often that trust was
betrayed.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In over nine years, I have seen the devastation reaped on your family. You have endured years of unimaginable suffering as you fought for justice. I have seen you cry, I have heard your screams of anguish behind closed doors and I have seen how anxiety, fear and frustration has followed every milestone in this case. Each member of your family has suffered from severe depression and breakdowns, compounded by your treatment at the hands of the authority. Kadi, who is not here but watching, your family left Kirkaldy unwilling for your children to grow up knowing that those connected to their uncle's death are free to patrol the streets. Kadi, you left your job at the hospital as a nurse where your brother was pronounced dead. Ade, you suffered from depression and your business failed. Collette, you suffered from a breakdown and moved away from your home with your baby boy unable to walk down the street where 500 yards away your beloved Shek died fighting for his last breath. Sheku's oldest son suffered from a whole number of issues relating to the loss of his father and, Aminata, your only son is gone and you say that your soul is shattered.

1	I find it deeply shameful that our so-called
2	civilised system of justice gave you false hope, yet
3	despite this you have refused to be bullied, to be
4	patronised or silenced and in his death, Sheku was
5	dehumanised, he was smeared, he was stereotyped, in
6	order to strip him of his right to life, but your
7	family's campaign slogan has been:
8	"The dead cannot cry out for justice. It is the
9	duty of the living to do so for them."
10	You have more than fulfilled that duty and I wanted
11	to pay tribute to your family because without you, there
12	would have been no Inquiry. And I hope that your
13	relentless desire to get to the truth ensures that
14	Sheku, a much loved partner, a son, a brother, an uncle,
15	a friend, is never forgotten. I hope this Inquiry will
16	be a lasting testament to your Sheku and a catalyst for
17	permanent change.
18	Thank you.
19	MS THOMSON: Thank you. Can we look at paragraph 3 of your
20	statement, please, Mr Anwar. Here you say a little bit
21	about your career and go on to say that you trained as a
22	criminal defence lawyer but ran a multidiscipline
23	practice that specialises in public inquiries, deaths in
24	custody and FAIs. You then say:
25	"A significant proportion of my practice, around 50

1 per cent, is pro-bono campaign where families are not entitled to legal aid funding or the family is taking on 2 3 sections of the state." 4 Now, for the benefit of those listening who are 5 perhaps not lawyers themselves, what is pro bono work? It's where lawyers will work for families for free and 6 Α. 7 there's no state funding. Now, when a person dies in state custody or following 8 Q. 9 contact with the police, what entitlement do their 10 family have to state-funded legal advice and representation? 11 12 In the first instance, there is no automatic legal aid Α. 13 funding in this country, despite promises made over the 14 years. Secondly, often it is a case that families are 15 told to wait until the fatal accident inquiry and then some weeks before you will be granted some form of a 16 17 fatal accident inquiry, but in our experience often 18 those fatal accident inquiries are some five years later 19 and the concern is from the moment that person dies in 20 state custody the family should have legal 21 representation, so families can have those fighting in 22 their corner advocating on their behalf and asking the questions that we did in the case of Sheku Bayoh. 23 There's no state funding immediately following a death 24 Q. in police custody --25

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. -- or following contact with the police? No funding
- 3 during the course of a criminal investigation?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. During a criminal trial?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. You have explained that there may be some funding during
- 8 a fatal accident inquiry or perhaps also a public
- 9 inquiry?
- 10 A. Only if the family reach the means test. So if their
- income is slightly too much over the line, they will not
- be funded and we have had that in many situations where
- families have fought for several years, as in the case
- of Katie Allan, where we had to fight tooth and nail
- where we had to get that family who fought for five
- 16 years after a suicide in Polmont to get funded.
- Q. And that's in the context of a fatal accident inquiry?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. You were first instructed by Mr Bayoh's families on
- 20 4 May 2015 and you initially represented them on a
- 21 pro-bono basis?
- 22 A. I could see for about seven years.
- 23 Q. This public inquiry was announced in November of 2019
- 24 and it was set up on 30 November 2020. Correct me if
- 25 I'm wrong, but am I right to understand that in December

- of 2020 a retrospective award was made for the costs of
- 2 legal work carried out in connection with the Inquiry,
- 3 which was backdated to the date of the announcement of
- 4 the Inquiry, so that would be November of 2019?
- 5 A. I would think so, yes.
- 6 Q. So you acted pro-bono then from May of 2015 until
- 7 November of 2019, that was perhaps four and a half years
- 8 later, would that be right?
- 9 A. That would be right, but if I can say, the other work
- 10 that we do is obviously not funded so it's only purely
- 11 funding for the Inquiry, so we continued to work with
- 12 regards to campaigning on behalf of the family and
- having their voices heard in the public domain.
- Q. And for the benefit of those listening, can you explain
- 15 the difference between work in connection with
- the Inquiry and your campaign work?
- 17 A. Well, the work with regards to the campaign work still
- 18 continues, the family want justice. It's not simply the
- 19 case of having the Inquiry. The family have always said
- if it had been somebody else's son what would they have
- 21 expected to happen? They would have expected to see a
- 22 criminal trial take place and that campaign has still
- 23 continued, whatever the conclusion of this Inquiry is.
- Q. Are you able to estimate how much of your time you gave
- 25 pro-bono to Mr Bayoh's families between May of 2015 and

1		November of 2019?
2	Α.	It's difficult to say, but I could probably estimate at
3		least 50 to 60 per cent. It seemed to be from morning
4		to night.
5	Q.	Sorry, is that 50 to 60 per cent of your working day,
6		your working week?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	In connection with this one family, this one campaign?
9	Α.	There would be intense moments where it was night and
10		day, sometimes you would say do a 14-, 15-hour day
11		preparing for meetings with Lord Advocates, Chief
12		Constables, for writing letters, for going to and fro
13		from the family and other days it would be quiet. So it
14		would be peaks and troughs, but I would say a minimum of
15		50 per cent of my time during a working week was related
16		to the Sheku Bayoh family.
17	Q.	Can we turn to paragraph 137 of your statement, please?
18	Α.	Sorry. Which paragraph?
19	Q.	137. It will come up on the screen as well. You say
20		here:
21		"This inequality of arms is an unacceptable
22		curtailing of justice, undermining in the case of
23		Sheku Bayoh and the potential for his family to
24		interrogate the facts and ensure harmful practices were
25		brought to light. The permanent balance between the

bereaved Bayoh families and the state was the most 1 2 significant injustice of the whole investigation 3 process. What many do not realise is the total 4 inequality of arms that flows from the death of the 5 Sheku. They had no right to legal aid funding. I acted on a pro-bono basis for several years. That brings its 6 7 own stresses and strains as you pour every resource into trying to hold to account the most powerful institutions 8 9 in the country. There were times that my firm almost did not survive as I poured everything into trying to 10 stay one step ahead, but vigilant for the battles that 11 12 lay ahead. This cannot be allowed to pass. This is 13 what happened to the Bayohs, despite our advocacy on 14 their behalf and the spotlight being brought to bear on 15 the criminal justice system. What happens to all those families who do not have that?" 16 17 You speak here about an inequality of arms, can you explain what you mean by that? 18 Well, when somebody dies in police custody or in prison 19 Α. 20 custody, often what happens is the family is told not to 21 worry and they will meet with authorities, with liaison 22 officers, told that don't worry there will be an investigation, it will be robust, it will be 23 independent, it will be impartial. Depending on the 24 background of the family, if they're middle class, they 25

1 will ask questions and they will try and ask as many 2 questions. If people are poor, if they're vulnerable, 3 they don't know what to ask. So it leaves those 4 authorities to investigate themselves, and by and large, 5 in my experience of nearly 25 years, all the families that we have represented have been left frustrated, 6 7 angered and upset, because they feel they have been betrayed, they have been lied to and denied 8 9 accountability and transparency and the state covers up 10 for itself and you have to fight and fight for every piece of paper and every disclosure of information. And 11 12 that is inequality because of course the state has an 13 army of lawyers. We have an army of lawyers sat just 14 where I have been sitting for the last two years, all 15 funded, all funded at the public purse. From the moment that there is a death in custody, they are all there and 16 17 the family of course is not entitled to that because they're told trust in the state. 18 19 You also speak in this paragraph about the stresses and Q. 20 strains of acting pro-bono. You say there were times 21 that your firm almost didn't survive. Can you say a little more about the stresses and strains? 22 By taking on a case that people have described as 23 Α. controversial, brings its own stresses and strains, 24 because you are in the firing line, you have to be the 25

voice for the family, you constantly have to take your 1 client's instructions, fight on their behalf, keep 2 3 fighting to raise the issue, but in that process, 4 because you're taking up all your time fighting a case 5 for pro bone, it means I'm not doing other paid work. So there was lots of lucrative work that potentially 6 7 came in my direction that I would have turn down, because I simply didn't have the time to do it. 8 9 Many people in my profession say I'm not a real 10 lawyer. Well, I regard this as the law field that I practice in and what it would mean is that I know on 11 12 several occasions when the family had no resources, they 13 didn't have money and they wanted to give up --14 I remember Kadi and Ade sent me a letter and I remember 15 when I opened that letter, because they wanted to give up and it was the first six months and I remember 16 17 bursting into tears because I thought they can't give up and I said "Don't worry, we'll keep going, we'll find a 18 19 way". And on several occasions I poured my savings, the 20 money I had made for my family, on a number of occasions 21 into to keep going to keep the firm afloat and to keep 22 fighting this case, but of course people outside they like to call human rights lawyers, legal aid lawyers 23 ambulance chasers. It's nothing of the sort. 24 So you have spoken frankly about the financial impact 25 Q.

1 and the steps that you had to take in order to keep your firm afloat during the period of time that you were 2 3 working pro-bono. What impact did this have on you 4 personally? 5 It had a huge impact. It wreaks havoc on your personal Α. relationships, because you become so focused on fighting 6 7 this case and trying to see it to the finishing line. I remember when I met with the family I said "We're in 8 9 for the long haul." I knew that from many years before 10 with the Surjit Singh Chhokar case. I naively told Mrs Chhokar it will take six months to a year when I was 11 12 a final year law student. It took 16 years, three 13 trials changing the law to get justice and now we're on, 14 what, nine -- over nine and a half years nearly. 15 So on a personal basis, it puts me in the firing line and people confuse what I do because if I'm 16 17 speaking -- I have taken the oath so I'm speaking honestly and I have never had to say this in public, but 18 my profession, members of my profession, members of the 19 20 media, see this, they see the colour and they like to 21 say that they don't see colour. What they mean is they

see the family's colour and they see my colour and they

think it's the same and so you face at the racism, but

you are not allowed to respond. I was taught that many

years ago by the lawyers for the Stephen Lawrence

22

23

24

25

family. You will be bated, you will be attacked, they will say they are coming for you, but never respond.

So you have to develop a thick skin and people always go it's about Aamer Anwar, but I have never once in 25 years have I ever complained about an act of racism personally in my profession against me. So you have to deal with the arguments, people telling you they know the facts, when actually they don't know the facts. You have to advocate on behalf of the family and I say it causes havoc in your personal relationships, causes havoc, because you're relentlessly trying to get to the end line and people don't understand it.

It's lonely and it has been a lonely fight over many years, because there were so many people -- I'm blessed by the team that I have around me, but for so many years, the last 25 years, the battles I have fought and the campaigns I have fought have been on my own. I have often had to go south of the border to seek advice from others to say what do I do? Because when I turned around to the profession here there wasn't anyone, but In the last few years I am blessed by the team that I have around me, but before that there was nobody. But in this case it caused huge strain, because on occasions -- I know in the final occasion before the Inquiry started I had a nervous breakdown.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, my life was an absolute mess and everything fell apart. I couldn't let my children know what had happened to me, I couldn't let my family know, I didn't see my mother for some several months, because I had to build myself back up and get ready for what we knew would be the fight of their life for the Sheku Bayoh family, but I also could not let the family know what I had done, but you're pushed into such a position that you're paranoid, justifiably. My anxiety, my paranoia built up over years has meant that it's a form of self-protection, but you are constantly check one thing, check it again, check it again, rewrite the speech, rewrite the words, check with the family, make sure, because you know one slip of the tongue and this system will pull you down, this system will do you for professional misconduct, this system will declare contempt of court, this system will say that's the end of your career and in the worst scenario you're going to prison. So I'm always on the watch for that, always on the

So I'm always on the watch for that, always on the watch, making sure I have to -- I always say to students when I do lectures to black or Asian students you have to work ten times harder, you have to prove yourselves ten times harder and, in fact, there's the females in our profession that have also had to go through that

process. And that is the only analogy I can say when

people say, oh, there's no racism, it's a level playing

field. It's a level playing field for a lot of people

here today, not a level playing field for people of my

colour or the people sat in the public gallery.

- Q. Given the financial impact and the personal stresses and strains of undertaking pro-bono work, which you have spoken about in your evidence very frankly, why do you continue to do this work and, in particular, why did you continue to represent Mr Bayoh's families on a pro-bono basis?
- A. In 1991, in November 1991, when I was a young student who had got involved in campaigning and politics at university, I had always thought I would leave Glasgow and go home to Liverpool and then on to London and I became involved in student politics and I was the victim of a racist attack by Strathclyde Police. I was taken behind a lane, I was chased, I was putting up posters before any of those to say I was committing a criminal offence. It was a criminal offence that was punishable by £21 under the Environmental Protection Act for putting up a fly poster. It wasn't worth the time or the energy for the police officers normally to do anything, but in this case I was chased, pushed to the ground, my head repeatedly slammed off the pavement, my

teeth smashed out and my head pulled back again smashed and I passed out and I was taken back into Ashton Lane and I was laid down and I opened my eyes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My mouth was bleeding, I couldn't feel teeth in the top of my mouth, I was terrified. I had grown up in Liverpool and I thought I am going to be one of those black boys that dies in the back of a police van and I remember that night asking the question from the police officer why and he says before I was kicked in the face, "This is what happens to black boys with big mouths" and I remember those four years I took on a civil action and my lawyer said to me at that time "No black or Asian person has ever won a civil action against the police in this country for a racist attack" and I remember naively saying at that time, and I still hope I have got a bit of naivety, I said "Just because they haven't doesn't mean you can't" and I went on to written that case. And in that time I was arrested some 20, 25 times. I had several court trials, it was constant, it was constant, move house, warrants for your arrest, constant harassment from the police.

When I won it, I decided I'm going back to law school. I'm one of the first case and I thought I need to give something back, I need to do something, because I learnt the hard way and I also genuinely believe if

you fight -- justice is never handed to you on a plate by our politicians and, with the greatest of respect to judges, but ordinary people fight for it and they come together. That's why there's trade unionists here, that's why there's politicians here. It's people that come together and I believe that I had something to give back and I wanted to fight, because I learnt -- there was two lessons learnt that night. One was that freedom and justice isn't handed to you on a plate, but the second lesson learnt probably by the police that this black boy's mouth just got bigger as the years went by and I've just --

And I have to say what makes me go on, it's the families I represent that inspire me every single day that even when you don't want to get up, when you have your darkest moments, you go you've got to keep going, because they keep going, so you keep going. Who else is going to do that work? Who else in Scotland does this work? People complain and moan about me, but I don't see anybody else volunteering to do it.

Q. And, indeed, you conclude this paragraph, paragraph 137, by asking "What happens to all those families that do not have that?" and that I think is a reference to families who do not have pro bono representation. I think you may have intended that as rhetorical question,

1		but is it a question to which you know the answer?
2	Α.	The only answer to that question should be I hope that
3		this government realises that families cannot be
4		expected to take on the might of our public
5		institutions, the most powerful institutions in this
6		country, and expect to get answers from them without the
7		right to legal representation. It is unfair, it's
8		unequal, it's an abuse of their human rights and, sadly,
9		we still don't have that. There's no automatic legal
LO		aid funding, because I know of course then there will be
11		a line of lawyers who will want to queue up and do this
12		sort of work, but until then it's very, very limited.
13		I could probably count on one hand individuals that
L 4		would take up these cases in Scotland.
L5	Q.	Let's look at this juncture at Lady Angiolini's report
16		of the Independent Review of Deaths and Serious
L7		Incidents in Police Custody. That was in England and
L8		Wales. That's SBPI 00496 published in 2017. If we
L9		could perhaps go to page 193 of the PDF and scroll down
20		to paragraph 15.2.
21		This is a chapter headed up "family support", where
22		Lady Angiolini states:
23		"The involvement of families in process should not
24		be seen as a matter of being sympathetic or benevolent
25		to bereaved relatives. It is the duty of the state to

1		ensure their participation is meaningful. In order to
2		facilitate such participation, families need free legal
3		advice, assistance and representation from the earliest
4		point following the death and this should be non-means
5		tested"
6		Is that a sentiment with which you would agree?
7	Α.	Absolutely, 100 per cent. Both the Bayoh family and the
8		many families I have represented over the years said
9		they don't care about the tea and sympathy and the
10		biscuits that they have met with at meetings and the
11		holding of hands and the offer of tributes to their
12		dignity and their courage. What they want is the truth.
13		They want accountability and fundamentally they want
14		justice and until we have that change in this country,
15		it's going to be difficult to get to.
16	Q.	Let's move forward to page 195 and look at paragraph
17		15.7. Here Lady Angiolini records:
18		"When an individual is arrested and taken into
19		custody, certain legal rights, including the right of
20		access to legal advice, flow from that status. The most
21		serious prospect that could ever arise for an arrestee
22		from the fact of being arrested is death and yet,
23		paradoxically, that event does not trigger the provision
24		of immediate access for next of kin of the deceased to

legal advice. The immediate aftermath of a death in

25

1		custody is the point of the process, more than any
2		other, when families are in urgent need of advice,
3		support and information about their rights, and the
4		processes that will ensue over the coming days and
5		months."
6		Again, is that a statement with which you would
7		agree?
8	Α.	Absolutely.
9	Q.	Let's look at the recommendation that Lady Angiolini
10		makes on page 238 at paragraph 33. This is the list of
11		her recommendations and recommendation 33 reads as
12		follows:
13		"In order to facility their effect participation in
14		the whole process, there should be access for the
15		immediate family to free non-means tested legal advice,
16		assistance and representation from the earliest point
17		following the death and throughout the pre-Inquest
18		hearings and Inquest hearings."
19		A reference, of course, to the English procedure.
20		Again, would you agree with that recommendation?
21	A.	Absolutely.
22	Q.	I want to move on to ask you some questions about your
23		first meeting with the Bayoh families and I wonder if we
24		can look at paragraph 40 of your statement. Again,
25		we'll bring that up on the screen. I understand that

1 you were instructed by the families on 4 May, Mr Anwar, 2 but your first in-person meeting with them was on 5 May, 3 the next day? 4 Α. Yes. 5 And here in your statement you say: Q. "One of the things that still stands out for me is 6 7 that at that meeting with the Bayoh family I said to them 'The elephant in the room will be racism' because 8 9 the family were speaking about racism. It has very much 10 occupied their minds. They believed it's because he was black that he died. They believe that the overwhelming 11 12 force that had been used on him was because of the 13 colour of his skin. They believe that he was being 14 criminalised in his life in order to justify his death 15 and when I said that we could not publically mention the word 'racism', there was an outburst in the room. I 16 17 tried to explain, because of the lessons I learnt from the past, about how the system just comes tumbling down 18 and they will say 'Aamer is playing the race card. 19 20 Where is your facts for it?' that we must bide our time, 21 but I wrongly assumed that the crown would have learned lessons and the issue of race would be front and centre 22 in any investigation. How wrong I was." 23 If we can continue and look at paragraph 41 as well, 24

25

please:

"I didn't know until very recently that when the family actually left that meeting they thought about not instructing me because they were so angry and upset that I said we're not going to address the issue of race publically." I would like to ask you some questions arising out of these two paragraphs. "I said that we could not publically the word 'racism'"; what do you mean about "publically" in this context? Α. I meant as in we, the family wanted to go public, they wanted to utilise the media, they wanted to meet the 

A. I meant as in we, the family wanted to go public, they wanted to utilise the media, they wanted to meet the politicians, they wanted to meet the Lord Advocate, they wanted to meet the Chief Constable. In all these engagements the media would be present, they would be public meetings, they wanted to campaign and they wanted to get to the truth.

Within the first 24 hours, the family thought there was something seriously wrong. They had been told five different versions of events and for me very much I had learnt my lesson from 20-odd years previously, 15 years previously, in the Chhokar case, where 1998 Surjit Singh Chhokar is murdered. I come out on behalf of the family at the STUC headquarters with the backing of the Lawrence family and we call it a racist murder. It took 16 years for us to prove the racial motivation, two

1 collapsed trials, an inquiry that we called a "whitewash", an inquiry that condemned me for 2 3 manipulating the family, which simply wasn't true, said 4 that I played the race card in some respects, many people said, newspapers, et cetera. I was called a 5 liar, I was humiliated publically and, again, I couldn't 6 7 say anything publically. I didn't defend myself and it took till 16 years 8 later for it to be proved it was a racially motived --9 10 for me, I had learnt my lessons over the years once I had trained as a lawyer that don't mention, because 11 12 people assume that I shout my mouth off and go "It's 13 racist, it's a racist murder." Well, in all the cases I 14 haven't done that. You have mentioned the cases there, 15 Chhokar, Simon San, Imran Khan, many of the race cases in Scotland that I've been at the heart of campaigning 16 17 and over those years, I have learnt the lesson to say, 18 as a lawyer, we must see the facts. I also incidentally 19 genuinely said to the family trust in the Crown Office, 20 trust in the PIRC, they will be robust, they will be 21 transparent, they will accountable, because obviously a 22 year later I had worked very closely with the crown, with the present Lord Mulholland, Lesley Thomson, as 23

Solicitor General, to get and campaign and justice for

the Surjit Singh Chhokar family, so I genuinely believed

24

25

1 that the system had changed and I said trust in them, but bit by bit that trust was shattered and eventually 2 some four or five months later the race word came to the 3 4 fore. I kept saying "They will do it, let's just see what 5 they do. It's not for us. They have to run the 6 investigation." After all, I didn't have the resources, 7 I didn't have access to the information, I didn't have 8 the disclosure of all the documents we now have in which 9 10 they lied and told us we're doing this and we're doing that. It's only now we know they didn't investigate 11 12 race, it never even came into their sights, it's only 13 when I kept raising it then they went "oh, we'll tell 14 them to investigate it" and that's when we knew it's too 15 late. Go back to paragraph 40, if we could have that on the 16 Q. screen again, please, the bottom part of that paragraph 17 18 where you say: 19 "I tried to explain because of the lessons I learn from the Chhokar family..." 20 21 When you say in your statement, Mr Anwar, "they'll 22 say Aamer is playing the race card", who is they? They are the Crown Office, the PIRC, the police and the 23 Α. Scottish Police Federation, because it all seemed to 24 work hand in hand when it came to the so-called 25

investigation into the death of Sheku Bayoh. They all 1 2 seemed to work. If one institution can't do it, they'll 3 pass the information on to the other. They'll run along and say "They're ones who can deal with this" in the 4 5 media. We might not be able to say it, but we can get the Scottish Police Federation to say it. If the 6 7 Scottish Police Federation can't say it, somebody else will say it. 8 9 So "they" to me as a person of colour and 10 represented the family was that the treatment very much was the same from all parties concerned, because it 11 12 wasn't the tea, biscuits and sympathy, some were very good at that, others were not, some were not extremely 13 14 arrogant. The problem was that all of them 15 fundamentally failed to deliver justice, and failed to deliver truth and accountability to the family, so 16 17 that's why it becomes "they". The criminal justice 18 system in this country is institutionally racist. Let's look at paragraph 42. This follows on from the 19 Q. 20 passage where you explained that you told the family 21 that race, racism were not to be mentioned publically 22 and you explain here: 23 "I did it tactically for a reason. I thought let's gather the evidence. Let's see how the COPFS and PIRC 24 deal with the issue of race. After all, it was their 25

1 responsibility. It should not have to be me to have to constantly remind them of their duties and good 2 3 practice. They had to be given a chance, but, as I said 4 repeatedly in public, the responsibility rested in the 5 hands of the crown and the PIRC to consider race. Bearing in mind that the issue of race had been flagged 6 7 up on the very first day by the family directly to the police and then to the FLOs. It's not as if they see 8 9 it, they'll deal with it. No, it should be a primary 10 issue. It was recognised in Stephen Lawrence it should be primary. It's not rocket science. A black man is 11 12 dead on the street so consider if his colour had a role 13 to play. After all, not one police officer could resist 14 using the word 'black' on multiple occasions in their 15 statements. It expected the family to believe on their return to the station and then the canteen that not one 16 17 person considered the issue of race." 18 When you say at the beginning of this paragraph, "I 19 did it tactically for a reason", is that a reference to 20 your advice to the family not to mention race 21 publically? 22 Α. Yes. And can you explain what you mean when you say "I did it 23 Q. tactically for a reason"? 24 I knew that if they mentioned the word "race" or I 25 Α.

mentioned it on behalf of them, the sole focus would 1 2 once again become me. It would be, as what I was called 3 for a years prior to this case, "race row lawyer, race 4 lawyer Aamer Anwar," rather than "human rights lawyer". 5 So I thought, first of all, it's not about me, it's not about we don't have the evidence, we had said to the 6 7 Lord Advocate, we had said to the PIRC, "We want a robust transparent investigation" and the family 8 9 repeatedly -- I said at press conferences the family 10 have faith in the PIRC, the family have faith in the Crown Office to carry out a robust and transparent 11 12 investigation, because, ultimately, I explained to the 13 family there is only one institution that can deliver a 14 prosecution of these officers: it is the Crown Office. 15 So of course I had to say to the family "Trust in them. This is years later. Of course they have changed. 16 17 will get justice and the family will get justice." So tactically for a reason I thought it's 18 presentation and it's also extracting information from 19 20 the crown and from the PIRC and saying to them the family is backing you by putting pressure on the crown 21 22 and we're saying the caveat is "you cannot fail, you cannot fail again, like you have done in every other 23 case that involved a person of colour in this country." 24 Q. This was a tactical decision, a deliberate decision to 25

- sit back and see how the crown and the PIRC addressed
  the issue of race?
- It wasn't ever a case of sit back, because I think, as 3 Α. 4 the Inquiry has seen, from the very offset my letters 5 were robust, they were comprehensive, I almost felt like I was leading the crown by the hand and saying what 6 7 about this, what about that, what about that and by and large they would ignore it and then we would try again 8 9 and try again and it would be weeks upon weeks of trying 10 letters and meetings to do that, but tactical for a reason as in it's their job to investigate, it's not my 11 12 job. I was a pro-bono lawyer, I didn't have a team of 13 lawyers. I do have a team over the years also work 14 pro-bono, came around, but in the beginning there was 15 nobody else. It was me on my own.
- Let's look at paragraph 26 of your statement, please. 16 Q. 17 Before I read this paragraph out, you refer to two individuals in this paragraph, Doreen Lawrence, she 18 19 I believe is the mother of Stephen Lawrence and Stephen 20 was murdered in a racially motived attack in 1993, and 21 you refer too to Imran Khan KC, who when he was a 22 solicitor, I believe, represented the family of Stephen Lawrence during the public inquiry; is that 23 24 right?
- 25 A. That's right.

Τ.	Q.	oust to give context to what you say and you also
2		mention Michael Mansfield, but there is an explanation
3		in the paragraph as to who he is.
4	Α.	They still represent Doreen.
5	Q.	Yes:
6		"Similarly, Doreen Lawrence's senior counsel,
7		Michael Mansfield KC, said to me when I started the
8		Chhokar campaign:
9		"'It's fine for me. I'm white, I'm middle class.
10		I'm seen as a knight in shining army who rides to the
11		rescue of these poor vulnerable black people, but when
12		you do it, Aamer, or Imran does it, you're playing the
13		race card. You must prepare to be attacked and you will
14		always be accused of having got an ulterior motive.'.
15		"I have to say this has been my experience to date.
16		The treatment, the exclusion by members of my
17		profession, combined with constantly being on high alert
18		as you wait to be falsely accused, vilified or
19		humiliated, but never able to speak to out on what I
20		believe to be racism, because otherwise I fall into the
21		trap by taking the bait and allow powerful forces, such
22		is the Scottish Police Federation, will say, 'Oh, look,
23		he's playing the race card. It's all about Aamer" or,
24		for example, accused by a good friend of theirs, Former
25		Justice Minister Kenny MacAskill of using the Bayoh case

to keep my profile high, adding that the ongoing
controversy was good for business."

So you speak here of your experience of being excluded, falsely accused, vilified, humiliated and unable to speak to out about what you believed to be racism and you have of course represented families of a number of individuals who have lost their lives in circumstances where race was or may have been a factor and in your statement you mention some of the families that you have represented including, of course, the family of Surjit Singh Chhokar.

So your experience is broader than your experience of representing the families of Mr Bayoh. I would like to ask what impact your experience has had on you personally?

A. It's like I say that from the moment I became a lawyer I felt I was under attack. Even people who had nothing to do for instance with the Chhokar case, it seemed as though every member of my profession wanted to have a say and tell me how I was wrong, tell me how this is not how we do things in this country, lawyers don't stand up and criticise the system. I would walk into rooms and I felt that feeling even the first day I walked into this Inquiry and I walked through there to take my seat there and I looked at my colleagues and how they look at you

1 and it's a feeling I have had my whole life and my profession people say "you're paranoid". It's not 2 3 paranoia, it's served me right, because I know exactly 4 how they talk about me, I know exactly how they look at 5 me and I know what they say behind my back and any opportunity to put the boot in, they do it and at times 6 7 when you're not able to respond. And as I said, Imran Khan had given me a piece of 8 9 advice at the start of the Chhokar case. He said you 10 will be attacked, they will come for you, do not respond, do not be bated because you're falling into the 11 12 trap of what the state does, because it will become 13 about you, rather than the family. On so much 14 occasions, so many occasions and I quoted there 15 Kenny MacAskill, who was the former Justice Minister, saying keep my profile high and good for business. How 16 17 little Mr MacAskill did he know. I'm not funded by millions of his pounds by the Scottish Police Federation 18 19 to represent the police officers. We were doing it 20 pro-bono. It wasn't good for business, it was bad for 21 business, and that humiliation of constantly having to 22 walk through life and being told you're not a real lawyer or you're just playing the race card. 23 Saying those words "playing the race card" is racist 24 in itself, because they wouldn't do it to 25

Michael Mansfield and that's the point. If lawyers sat there were picking up awards, white lawyers, and fighting for a black family, they would be feted as human rights campaigners, but someone like me, someone like Imran Khan, constantly attacked, told you have an ulterior motive. I am going it's not an ulterior motive, I am doing my job to the best of my ability and I have continued to try and do it, despite the attacks and the vilification and it has had a huge toll. You can tell probably from what I'm saying it's -- I am constantly on alert and worry.

I have switched off my mobile phone commentary on Twitter, I have the most following on Twitter of any solicitor I think in the UK, and yet I have to turn my commentary off, because no matter what I say, you switch it on and you are attacked, you are abused. I have had death threats over the years and whilst I can't say individuals in the police of the Federation are responsible, the fact that the whipping up of the abuse and the racism against my puts me in the firing line because people go, in this present period, where human rights lawyers are being attacked, some attempted murders of individuals and I have had to move house, I have had my life threatened. And I'm at a stage where I have my children, who are of an age who can now read

social media, I have protected them my whole life, I have not wanted them to know what their father has to deal with, but they can read for themselves now and they ask me questions.

I have my mother who I constantly have to tell, who worries herself sick from that night when I was attacked by the police. I say mum "don't read it, don't read it," and then when the death threats come in and, of course, who is it I have turn to to ask for help? It's the police. And I remember saying to Iain Livingstone, who I built up a relationship over many years with, former Chief Constable, saying to him one time when they installed a panic alarm, because there was a direct threat to me, and I said, "Your police officers won't come," and he said "What do you mean? Of course we'll come." I went "They'll find out it's me, they'll wait 30 minutes or an hour and it will be too late."

So I walk through those streets and I know that I spend my life thinking today is it my last day? When somebody comes up to speak to you to say something to you, I think is this it? Is this the moment that I lose my life? That's a huge burden that I have on my shoulders and I have never ever been able to publically say that.

So that's the impact of these cases and people don't

1 seem to understand what it does to you as a lawyer, but 2 more so as a human being, more so as a father, more so 3 as a partner and as a friend in relationships, just how 4 you with on the day to day. You're constantly upset, 5 you wake up with this cloud over you, you are worrying 6 all the time. 7 And again, is this the sort of experience that fed into Q. you advice to the families of Mr Bayoh not to mention 8 race publically? 9 10 Α. Absolutely, because I did not want them to be attacked. I wanted the crown to do its job. That's what they're 11 12 paid to do, to do their public duty and investigate it 13 to the best of their ability. That's what I believed they would do and how wrong I was. 14 15 Q. I would like to put to you for comment evidence that 16 we've heard from Deborah Coles. This is in her Inquiry 17 statement, but it's a short paragraph. I don't think we 18 necessarily need it on the screen, although if we have 19 it handy, It's SBPI 00607. Wonderful. And it's 20 paragraph 28. 21 I will read the paragraph short, but we'll see 22 within that paragraph Ms Coles says: "The question of whether racism had contributed to 23 the treatment of a loved one was invariably in the minds 24

of black families, but not one that most felt they could

25

1 actually raise, because they feared being seen to play 'the race card' and provoke additional hostility in a 2 3 process that they experienced from the outset as being 4 hostile and adversarial. Raising the issue of race, 5 families said, could elicit accusations of having a chip 6 on you shoulder, being militant, seen as an angry black 7 family." Does that fit with you own experience? 8 100 per cent. 9 Α. 10 Q. And again if I could perhaps take you to the evidence of Marcia Rigg. If we have her statement to hand, it's 11 12 00630, paragraph 108. Thank you. If we could scroll 13 down a little, please. There we are. Three lines from 14 the top of the page: 15 "My family felt it was obvious racism was there, but we decided not to raise the issue of racism because we 16 17 didn't want to be labelled with a chip on our shoulder and to be using the race card." 18 19 And Marcia Rigg of course is the sister of the late 20 Sean Rigg. Again, how does her experience fit with you 21 own? 22 It matches it completely, 100 per cent agreement every Α. word that she said. 23 Q. I would like to move on now to look at a press statement 24 that was issued on behalf of the Bayoh families 25

following a conference on 14 May 2015, and a good starting point, I think, would be to return to your statement and look at paragraph 203. Let's begin by reading this paragraph, Mr Anwar, and then we'll look at the press release itself:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"I have been asked about the Bayoh family press conference on 14 May 2015 and the subsequent press release from the Scottish Police Federation. We arranged a press conference to take place on 14 May 2015, which was around the corner from Crown Office in Chamber Street. I read out a statement which was subsequently issued as a press release. I was very careful in what I said. I have explained to the family that I'm not going to mention the word 'race', that we have to give the PIRC and the crown the opportunity to carry a full scale investigation without being hindered or speculated upon. This was a live investigation, I was very much viewing it that this was a live criminal investigation, nothing must be done to prejudice it. At that point in time, I don't know what the position is, because the police officers haven't given statements. I have my own suspicions. I believe overwhelming force has been used. I believe he's in a mental health crisis from what I have read, but I still don't know."

So let's look at the press release. It's AAC 00387. 1 This is four pages long, but quite large print and 2 3 double-line spacing so what I would like to do is go 4 through at it with you quite quickly. I think it's 5 important that we capture all of this press release. So we see this forms part of a press pack for the 6 7 conference on 14 May, and you note that a meeting will take place with the Lord Advocate at 1.30 am in private 8 9 and that a statement would be made following the 10 meeting. Was that the order of events? Did the meeting take place first and the press conference happen 11 12 afterwards? 13 Α. Yes. You go on to list the family members who would be 14 Q. 15 present with you at the press conference and then there is the text of the statement itself. You introduce 16 17 yourself as the solicitor acting on behalf of the 18 families, and you introduce Collette and Kadi. You then 19 begin just at the bottom of the screen as we see it just 20 now by saying: 21 "I would like to start by making a statement on 22 behalf of the family. Sheku Bayoh was a well liked, peaceful and healthy young man who at the age of 31 had 23

no previous history of violence. It would appear he

left his home sometime between 7.00 and 7.30 am, walking

24

25

39

an approximate distance of a mile. The family is advised that police officers, who were in the midst of a shift change at Kirkaldy Police Office, responded to an alert following calls from members of the public.

"We are advised that some six police cars went to the scene and that a minimum of nine uniformed officers engaged with Mr Bayoh. Of course any use of force must at all times be lawful, necessary and proportionate in the circumstances. Reports of any officer having been stabbed are simply untrue. Mr Bayoh was detained and restrained with handcuffs to the rear and leg restraints, following which he lost consciousness. CPR was attempted at the scene, an ambulance called and he was officially pronounced dead at Victoria Hospital at 9.04 am.

"Following Sheku's death, five different versions of events were given to the family by Police Scotland officers over the course of 10 hours, until they were finally told he had died in police custody. That is a matter of grave concern. Sensitive and thorough handling of the investigation in the golden hours following the death is critical to evidence gathering and setting the direction quality of the investigation to follow. The family has grave concerns with regards to what happened on Sunday. Furthermore, the family

does not understand why the officers involved in engaging with Sheku Bayoh were not immediately suspended without prejudice after his death. It is a matter of wider public concern that officers remain at their desks or in contact with the public pending the outcome of the investigation into death in custody. For the Chief Constable to suspend the officers without prejudice is not a question of prejudging the outcome of the investigation, but ensures neutrality, integrity of the investigation, transparency, as well as protecting officers involved in such incidents.

"The Bayoh family understands that neither PIRC nor the Lord Advocate can enforce such a decision and would strongly urge Chief Constable Stephen House to take full control of the situation. The family welcome the Lord Advocate's instruction last on Tuesday for PIRC to take over the whole investigation into the death of Sheku Bayoh. However, they were saddened to learn that some 11 days after Sheku's death that Police Scotland has still not provided all the essential information to PIRC's investigation team. This approach simply beggars belief and prolongs the agony of Sheku's family.

I would strongly urge police officers to cooperate with the investigation to help provide Mr Bayoh's family, the Crown Office and the PIRC with accurate information

about how and why Mr Bayoh died.

"The family are trying to remain openminded, but neither the crown pathologists or their own independent pathologists can reach a conclusion into the cause of death until a full account of what happened that morning is given by the police officers who detained Mr Bayoh."

Sorry, if we can scroll a little please, thank you.

"There has been a great deal of speculation in both papers and the local community, none of which is helpful in a live inquiry. The family retain full confidence in the PIRC and would urge both police officers and members of the public with information to come forward and fully cooperate with PIRC's investigation.

"The findings of the postmortem are not complete and could take several more weeks to complete. We have instructed some of the UK's most eminent pathologists to act independently on behalf of the family. They will offer every assistance to the Lord Advocate's team as we are aware that such deaths in custody are a rare occurrence in Scotland. Today the family are putting their total faith and trust in the Lord Advocate and PIRC. There are many grave concerns that the family will express in private to the Lord Advocate later on this morning, which cannot be mentioned due to a live inquiry.

1		"The Crown Office, Police Scotland and PIRC must now
2		act decisively to restore confidence and satisfy the
3		need for a robust and demonstrably independent
4		investigation. Nobody should be allowed to evade
5		accountability or frustrate the investigation process.
6		Sheku Bayoh's family will not rest until they have the
7		truth."
8		So that was the text of the press statement that you
9		made on 14 May 2015 on behalf of Mr Bayoh's families.
10		Did you say anything beyond what is recorded in that
11		statement? Did you go off script at all?
12	Α.	No, I don't believe I did, I tried not to. I do
13		remember I think it was a journalist from The Sun and
14		from The Guardian that tried to ask me about whether
15		race or colour had anything to do with it. I said, "We
16		refuse to speculate, there must be a full
17		investigation."
18	Q.	I think you mention that in fact in your statement at
19		paragraph 204, so if we could perhaps have that on the
20		screen. Paragraph 204 is effectively your commentary on
21		that press release. You say:
22		"The content of our press release is not
23		controversial. I have not speculated, it is not
24		hyperbolic. It's not exaggerated. The family is
25		openminded. I'm not blaming the officers. I'm laying

out facts as are known publically. I am not relaying a narrative of the events of what happened; I refuse to engage with that. I ask for police officers to cooperate, people to come forward and I express concern about officers not being separated and what goes on. I don't find mention the word 'race'. In fact, when I was sitting on the platform, I was asked by two journalists about racism. I said 'I'm not going to comment on that; I'm not here to speculate'."

And we have looked at the press release and race doesn't feature in the press release at all.

If we could scroll down to paragraph 206, you say here that within minutes of you press release ending that Scottish Police Federation and their lawyer were publically issuing a vivid description of what they claimed return to have happened.

We will return to this paragraph in a moment, but before we do that, let's look at the actual text of the SPF press release itself. That is COPFS 05339. So we see that the -- or we'll see shortly that the content of the press release is in an email. Sorry, if we could scroll up again just a moment and stop there, thank you. We see it is dated 14 May and timestamped at 12.48. And, again, if we scroll down to the blue text, this is the text of the press release issued on behalf of

1 PBW Law:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"'The rights of the police must be defended' says top lawyer. The legal adviser to the Scottish Police Federation has strongly criticised statements made at a press conference in Edinburgh by the family and lawyers of the late Sheku Bayoh. Professor Peter Watson of PBW Law said:

"'I am disturbed about the unhelpful and ill-informed comments being made by the family lawyer. Whilst it is deeply regrettable that Mr Bayoh lost his life, I would ask the media and public to remember that a petite female police officer was chased and then subjected to a violent and unprovoked attack by a very large man, who punched, kicked and stamped on her. The sister believed that she was about to be murdered and I can say that but for the intervention of the other officers, that was the likely outcome. The family's advisers appear to believe that the police do not have the same legal rights as other members of the public, they do, and I intend to defend those rights robustly. We all seek the truth and part of that truth will lie in part in the postmortem and toxicology reports which will follow in due course. Calls for the suspension of the officers serve no purpose and do nothing but add unhelpful rhetoric in a difficult situation for all'."

So I wanted to look at the actual text before we 1 2 return to paragraph 206 of your statement in which you offer comment on the text here. So let's look at you 3 4 statement and I'll perhaps ask you some further 5 questions after we have done that. So paragraph 206, so scroll perhaps to the top of 6 7 the next page. You begin here by quoting from the press release and it's Peter Watson's statement: 8 9 "I'm disturbed about the unhelpful and ill-informed 10 comments being made by the family lawyer." 11 You say: 12 "What's he disturbed about? What was unhelpful and 13 what was ill-informed? There's absolutely nothing in 14 that statement that he issues that on that he could know 15 was ill-informed. He has assumed what I am going to say. It was an attack on my professionalism, on my 16 17 credibility and integrity. Ultimately, it was an attack on the family, is the way I see it. It was to try and 18 shut them down." 19 20 So before we go any further, let me ask you some 21 questions about what is written in that part of that 22 paragraph. You say that there was nothing in your press release that was ill-informed, and that you consider 23 that assumption had been made about what were you going 24

to say. And you had said at the beginning of paragraph

25

206 that this press release was made within minutes of
yours.

Is it your belief that the statement was made before

Mr Watson had heard your statement to the press or

after?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I can't be clear about that, but what I would say is Α. there was actually one that I know was made around about 1.15, 11.20, which I think was Brian Docherty from the Scottish Police Federation. The terminology that Mr Docherty used was practically identical in parts to that made by Mr Watson, but it seemed to me that they had a preprepared script, because this was coming from Jack Irvine's Media House, Peter Watson, Calum Steele, Brian Docherty and others were obviously involved in putting together a press release. And I for the life of me thought they're just assuming this is Aamer Anwar of 2000 coming out on the steps of the High Court, attacking the crown, attacking the police and thinking, "here he goes again. He'll play the race card. He'll be ill-informed, unhelpful, he'll be on the attack" and I was nothing of the sort, because I was talking about wanting witnesses to come forward, for police officers to cooperate. I was saying that any force used, which was helpful, because I said police officers are of course entitled to defend themselves, but any force used

has to be lawful, legitimate and proportionate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I mentioned fact that despite the police source that was never found that no police officer was stabbed, which is always the case after a death in custody lies are told and then all of a sudden nobody can find out who from the police told them that. And I said that police officers should be suspended without prejudice. I could not for the life of me see how these seven, eight, nine officers were put in the canteen together after Sheku's death, how that was helpful? If they were members of the public and one of them was a potential accused, there is no way they would be put in a room together, they would be separated and taken in for questioning and in fact that was at the case on the day. Collette was taken in separately, Saeed was taken in separately, Martin was taken in separately, his partner was taken in separately. They had facilities for them, but they put all the police officers together.

And Mr Watson -- if there was anybody who was unhelpful and ill-informed, it was Mr Watson, because he set out a narrative on 14 May when the multiple police officers that he was representing all of them hadn't given a statement. So it was almost like here's the party line, this is what happened, and we're sort of wondering what the hell is going on, because this is

already put in the public domain, when all we're asking for is police officers to cooperate and give their statements if they're police officers and of course we are told pretty much from the first couple of days that the police officers were told that they had witness status and we were constantly asking everyday, have they given a statement, have they given a statement, because of course it's the police officers that would be speaking about what happened and if they had nothing to hide, then they had nothing to fear. And with the greatest of respect to Mr Watson, police officers are not the same as members of the public. So there was nothing unhelpful, nothing ill-informed there was no rhetoric in what I had to say.

Q. You say in your statement that you saw this as an attack on you professionalism and you credibility and integrity. Can you explain why you saw it that way?

A. If any lawyer sat back there representing the PIRC, the Federation, the Chief Constable, the Lord Advocate, the Crown Office were told that their comments were ill-informed, they would be upset I think professionally. If they were told that they were using rhetoric, they would be upset, they would be kicking up a stink about it, but it seemed to me as though anything can be said about me publically. I can be called a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

liar, I can be called I am playing the race card, as I down the line eventually am, ill-informed comments and it's on me and I'm going what do? Well, what do I do? It's a case of I can't get into, you know, a boxing match with Mr Watson. I can't do that publicly, because I had to remain focused on the family cannot be diverted into that. We maintain the line trust in the crown and the PIRC to carry out an independent, robust, transparent investigation for the police officers to cooperate, and give their statements. The family wanted to know that the police officers have done that and of course they weren't, but meanwhile they're seeing this narrative being played out how a police woman would have been murdered, subjected to a violent and unprovoked attack, by a very large man, who was 5 foot 10, 12 stone, ten pounds and was smaller than me at the time, and I was going there was actually two officers that were bigger than him, 6 foot 4, up to 25 stone each, which we weeks later found out so. And he says "But for the intervention of other officers, that was the likely outcome" How did Mr Watson know that? Full investigation hadn't carried out. How did he know that? How informed was he? Was

he sitting there? Was he watching from the window? Was

he a member of the public or did he just simply take the

1		script from his officers who of course are involved in
2		the death of Sheku Bayoh?
3	Q.	Returning to your statement, the passage that you have
4		just alluded to and the comment made by Mr Watson is at
5		the bottom of paragraph 206, but if we could read on to
6		the top of 207, please:
7		"He is expressing an opinion as to the potential
8		outcome. It begs the question as a lawyer why is he
9		personally commenting. It's not about his personal
10		belief. We don't even have statement at that time from
11		the police officers."
12		And I think the personal comment that you were
13		critical of is where Mr Watson says:
14		"The police officer believes she was about to be
15		murdered and I can say that but for the intervention of
16		the other officers, that was a likely outcome."
17		Help me to understand why you're critical of that
18		comment?
19	Α.	Well, I think it wasn't just that I don't come it was
20		just that comment. I think it was all of it. It's about
21		violent unprovoked attack, because of course for years
22		the family have had to deal with until the public
23		Inquiry came it was portrayed in public that
24		Sheku Bayoh, "a very large black man", subjected police
25		officers to a violent and unprovoked attack and people

have always assumed that Sheku was the first to go on attack and of course we now know that the real facts are that's not true. He was subjected to CS spray he was subjected to Pava spray, he was hit with a baton, he was shoulder barges and then after that there is an incident with Nicole Short. So that is the first part, the setting of the scene. Not that this comes afterwards, because that's almost what's being portrayed and then it is to say:

"She was about to be murdered and I can say but for the intervention of the other officers, that was the likely outcome."

How did he know that and why was it -- why would that not be seen as interfering with a live investigation for a lawyer to stand up in the public domain and put those out as a narrative of the facts when the PIRC are busy trying to get statements from those police officers? Why would you put that in the public domain? And it's a standard tactic of course used by -- up and down this country by police lawyers get that out first of all and then you spend time as the family did having to defend Sheku in his death, having to say he wasn't armed, he didn't stab a police officer, he was hit first by CS spray, Pava spray, he was one who was hit with a baton and then there's a response. So is

1		it violent? Is it unprovoked? That's what the job of
2		the PIRC was to find out.
3	Q.	Let's return to paragraph 207, four lines down:
4		"The press release continues and alleges: 'The
5		family's advisers appear to believe that police do not
6		have the same legal rights as other members of the
7		<pre>public'."</pre>
8		And you say:
9		"This is completely and utterly untrue. At that
LO		time, I was representing multiple police officers and
L1		had acted for the Scottish Police Federation in the past
L2		and at that time in my statement I had said '
L3		suspended without prejudice,' ' Protecting their
L 4		rights.' They have rights, so I didn't say that."
L5		Mr Anwar, are you aware of anything in your
L 6		statement that could have been taken as suggesting that
L7		police officers do not have the same rights as members
L8		of the public?
19	Α.	Absolutely not. I said "suspendd without prejudice".
20		They of course have a right to silence. They should
21		have been separated. They were told in fact unlike
22		other members of the public, they were told almost
23		straightaway that they had witness status and then for
24		32 days the representatives held out and it was a public
25		dingdong that went on between the PIRC and we had to

1 keep going backwards and forwards to saying to PIRC it would be helpful rather than us on behalf of the family 2 3 having to say they haven't given statements and the PIRC 4 was saying to us, we've told them they have witness 5 statements. 6 There was nothing unhelpful with regards to that 7 and, as I say in there, what the Scottish Police Federation probably don't like me to say is that I had 8 9 represented multiple police officers on that occasion 10 and after that as well. It was fine for them to have me representing police officers, but then to say I don't 11 12 believe police officers have the same rights. I have 13 always worked on the principle that if I think somebody has done something wrong, then I'll raise the issue and 14 15 where police officers have acted within the law, I have represented them to the best of my ability and was doing 16 17 so at that time in relation to data protection offences in other cases, highly publicised cases, and the police 18 Federation knew that. 19 20 I was of course invited to Scottish Police 21 Federation dinners, annual dinners, and to speak at 22 their meetings. So all of a sudden, black man dies in police custody and I am the enemy, but I wasn't the 23 enemy before; why? 24

LORD BRACADALE: Let's look at paragraph 209. You reference

25

1 here a further press release issued in response to the 2 SPF press release the same day. 3 "The Bayoh family were deeply hurt by the tone of 4 the press release issued by the SPF and they felt 5 insulted and falsely accused." 6 So you explain here how the family felt, but can I 7 ask how did you felt? What impact did the SPF or Mr Watson's press release have on you personally? 8 Well, it felt like deja vu and I thought here we go 9 Α. 10 again. I genuinely thought that that press release was prepared with the family. It was very -- there was lots 11 12 of things taken out because you can't say that, can't 13 say that, can't do that. We need to keep it within that. 14 Can't speculate. It's a live investigation. We are 15 appealing to the public come forward, appealing to the police officers, let the investigation be carried out 16 17 and yet of course the Scottish Police Federation or 18 their representatives weren't going to attack the 19 family, just in the same way the Stephen Lawrence family 20 weren't attacked, attack the lawyer, the mouthpiece, the 21 advocate on behalf of the family. 22 Yes, the paranoia was back, because I thought despite all these years passing, despite me having 23 worked with the system, despite me having represented 24 police officers, it didn't really matter, because when I 25

1 start to raise a question about the actions of officers, 2 I will come under robust attack. So I was paranoid, 3 I was upset, and it was again -- it was insulting, it 4 was an attack on my integrity and I was back in the same 5 position of taking the advice, do not defend yourself, try not to get into a war with them, a war of words. 6 7 I would like to take you to one or two paragraphs in the Q. statement of Calum Steele to invite your comment. His 8 9 Inquiry statement is SBPI 00556. And Mr Steele at the 10 relevant time was the general secretary of the SPF, I believe. 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 And if we can look at paragraph 33 and 35 together and Q. 14 then I'll invite your comment. 33: 15 "The issue here is that from the get-go this was not any other death in custody which was obvious and it was 16 17 obvious principally because Aamer Anwar made it not about any other death in custody and the early inference 18 that he was presenting was that police officers had 19 20 killed Mr Bayoh because of the colour of his skin so 21 that was very obviously something that the SPF had to deal with." 22 23 And if we could scroll down, please, to 35: 24 "In terms of Mr Anwar, inferring Mr Bayoh was killed by the police because of the colour of the skin at this 25

1 stage it has been pointed out that this press release was issued about 11 days after Mr Bayoh has died. I 2 3 have been asked whether I can recall anything that I 4 read in the press release or any commentary from any 5 other source that led me to that conclusion. Well, in those 11 days I couldn't point to anything specific but 6 7 the general commentary from Mr Anwar's very early involvement was an inference that the colour of 8 9 Mr Bayoh's skin was a contributing factor in his death. 10 Although the example I give here came sometime after his death, it's blatantly obvious that Mr Anwar was making 11 12 such an inference." 13 And I have already looked at your press release from 14 11 May and there's nothing in it about race or racism. 15 Could I simply invite your comment on this criticism? Well, Calum Steele is 100 per cent wrong and this shows 16 Α. 17 the institutional racism of the Scottish Police Federation that couldn't see beyond my colour, because 18 19 they assumed automatically or from the very beginning 20 I was talking about race, yet you have seen my press 21 release, I had the press conference, the camera crews were there and I didn't mention race. I avoided the 22 issue, I refused to comment on it and, in fact, I didn't 23 just refuse to comment on it for those 11 days. 24 I kept refusing to comment on it for the month of 25

May, for the month of June and into July and then it was I think around about 15 September or October 15, I think that's when it went public. So Mr Calum Steele is completely and utterly wrong. He can't find anything in my press release that I've mentioned about race, yet they persisted with that argument, not just amongst their colleagues, but publically by issuing circulars to over 16,000 police officers which put me in the firing line, because every police officer in this country thought, Aamer Anwar is playing the race card, when I was doing the exact opposite. 

Q. Can we return to your statement, please, and look at paragraph 213 in which you comment on an SPF press release of 2 June. And the text of that press release is incorporated into the paragraph. So 213:

"I have been asked about the SPF press release of 2 June 2015, at the press release as drafted is headed 'Family lawyer heavily criticised' and states that 'The comments made by those representing the family of the deceased continued to promote a completely inaccurate and misleading account. The officer injured remains off work, has had several hospital visits and is now in rehabilitation. An examination by a leading consultant confirms her injuries were significant. The injuries have been documented and photographed. The officers

involved have never refused to provide statements. It 1 was agreed at the outset with PIRC that they would 2 3 revert to us when they wanted statements and when they 4 were clear on the basis that statements were to be 5 given. Mr Anwar can try to throw whatever mud he wishes but the fact remains that a petite female police officer 6 7 was violently assaulted by a large male and believed she was going to die as a consequence. In directing 8 9 increasingly hyperbolic, inaccurate and bizarre rhetoric 10 at the Scottish Police Federation, one could be mistaken for believable that Mr Anwar being at the centre of 11 12 attention appears to be of greater importance than 13 allowing the investigation to proceed without 14 interference." 15 Now, I understand that you kept copies of all of the press articles relating to the death of Mr Bayoh and 16 17 that those published between the date of his death and 2 June are all included within a single compendium which 18 has the reference AAC 00379. That has been published on 19 20 our website and is available to the Chair for his consideration, so the Chair can take into account all of 21 the --22 23 A. Yes. Q. -- commentary between the date of the death and the 24

2 June, but may I invite your comment on the suggestion

25

1 here that you had "thrown mud"? 2 It's simply not true. Simply not true. In terms of Α. mud, in relation to the officer, Nicole Short, which is 3 4 who he's referring to, it was Mr McSporran, the senior 5 investigator for the PIRC, that told me at the time as he sat in the seat opposite me in my office he says: 6 7 "Aamer, Nicole Short was only in the hospital for 30-odd minutes and then she was back in the station." 8 9 And then we found out that Nicole Short was back for 10 some up to seven or eight hours back in the canteen with her fellow officers. So that was the first thing. The 11 12 line he says: 13 "It was agreed at the outset with PIRC that the 14 officers involved have never refused to provide 15 statements." Well, that simply is not true, because the PIRC kept 16 telling us again and again that we requested statements 17 and they refused. It was only 32 days later that 18 19 statements were provided and it seems to be either the 20 PIRC are telling the truth or Mr Watson is telling the 21 truth, it can't be both of them, because it was 32 days 22 later and we were told by the PIRC they requested their statements and they were offered witness status. So 23 that was the first thing. 24 Mud, there was no mud thrown. It wasn't hyperbolic, 25

1 it wasn't inaccurate, it wasn't bizarre, but what that smacks of for me is the usual stereotyping that goes on 2 3 of black or Asian people to try and make out that we're 4 mad, that we're oversensitive, that we're hyperbolic, 5 that we have got a chip on our shoulder, that we're playing the race card. That's what that language is 6 7 about. That's exactly what that language is about. Q. Let's look at paragraph 214 of your statement. I think 8 9 I'll read it together with 215: 10 "The SPF are percentage it. They're trying to bait me to get me to respond to personal attacks, and I'm 11 12 trying to resist. But the pressure is unbearable. It's 13 unbearable for me personally, but I'm a lawyer so I'm 14 expected to take it on the chin. If there's a white 15 lawyer out there and every week somebody prints an article which just personally attacks you for doing your 16 17 job, what would they be doing about it? The Law Society would be up in arms. Everybody would be saying 'How 18 dare you make an attack?' 19 20 "But it seems to me that over the years it's become 21 a case of 'Oh, it's Aamer Anwar. It's fine; it doesn't 22 have any impact on him personally.' So I saw a concerted attempt to break the family and if they 23 couldn't break the family directly, then indirectly you 24 go for the lawyer because if you break the lawyer, you 25

1 break the campaign and you shut it down, I saw that years before with Chhokar and I saw it years before when 2 3 criminalised by the police for taking them on for 4 smashing a face in a racist attack, and in this they did 5 every trick in the book." 6 So you say here that it's become a case of, oh, it's 7 Aamer Anwar, it's fine, it doesn't have any impact on him personally. Does this have an impact on you 8 personally? 9 10 Α. It does have an impact on me personally, because I keep saying I have to have developed this thick skin. People 11 12 keep telling me and it's all very nice, you know, 13 friends, family say just ignore it, just ignore it. You 14 can't ignore it, because when you shut the door and 15 you're on your own, it comes back to you when you switch on your phone, when you get a letter threatening you 16 17 with legal action or threatening the family, you go through your script and say, have I said anything wrong? 18 19 Have I done anything wrong? 20 I check my statements again and again and again. I 21 have learnt the hard way after facing contempt of court 22 and being put on trial before three of the most senior judges in this country for standing up for the rights of 23 my client, that your life can be finished, your 24 professional career, in the worst instance you can be 25

sent to prison. So I know what that feels like, but

everybody does think, oh, it's Aamer Anwar, it's a

laugh, it's a joke.

I would like to know how everyone of those white lawyers sat there would feel if their life was threatened, if they had to have panic alarms installed, CCTV cameras installed because of death threats made to you because you stand up and you fight the cases that I do. There would be uproar, there will be questions raised in parliament, but with me it just carries on. If any of these lawyers were subjected to surveillance by the Scottish Police Federation or by Police Scotland, there would be uproar. It would be interference with the rights of a lawyer, but when it comes to Aamer Anwar of course, oh, it's just part of the course, nobody is interested.

But of course it's not about me. I keep trying to tomorrow that and that's hard, because I do instinctively want to fight back, but I have to remember I'm a lawyer representing that family who are sat there and have to ensure that we get it to the finishing line. So over the years you just keeping going and you keep going and try and ignore it, but it has a traumatic effect because it's upsetting. It breaks you down. I have had a nervous breakdown, I have been close to a

1	breakdown and I just have to sort of
2	Even when I walk into this room, I'm sat there, I've
3	spent the last two years feeling uncomfortable,
4	uncomfortable sat there, how people look at you when you
5	walk into the room, the muttering that goes on. I feel
6	like when I go into court rooms and people turn around
7	and look at you, the remarks that are made and I see it
8	when people comment publicly about it or on the
9	commentary pages and feel, don't have to worry, because
LO	Aamer Anwar is not going to come back at us.
L1	Aamer Anwar is not going to make a complaint.
L2	In fact, I remember the Scottish Police Federation
L3	when they went on the attack, I sought legal advice from
L 4	the Dean of The Faculty of Advocates on how to take out
L5	a case for defamation. Several months later, the Dean
L 6	of the Faculty of Advocates was representing the
L7	Scottish Police Federation. That's how it works in this
L8	country. Did I make a complaint? No, I didn't.
L 9	Q. One moment, please. Sir, I'm going to be moving on to
20	another subject, I wonder if this would be a convenient
21	time for the morning break?
22	LORD BRACADALE: Yes, we'll take a break for 20 minutes.
23	(11.28 am)
24	(A short break)
25	(11.57 am)

1 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson.

2 MS THOMSON: Thank you. Mr Anwar, I would like to move on 3 to ask you questions about some articles that appeared 4 in the press on 25 and 26 July 2015. To put this in 5 context, I believe that 25 July 2015 was the day on which the Justice for Sheku Bayoh Campaign was launched 6 7 and I understand that you may have made a statement at that specific launch. We don't appear to have a copy of 8 9 that statement, however what was said was reported in a 10 number of the newspapers online on 25th and then in printed version on 26th, so I would like to take you to 11 12 those.

13 A. Okay.

21

22

23

24

25

Q. There are just two articles we need to look at, I think.

Let's look, firstly, at The Sunday Herald of 26 July

2015 and this is in another of the compendiums of

newspaper cuttings that you provided to the Inquiry,

AAC00380. Lovely, thank you. Now, for context can we

look at the second page of the PDF, sorry, the third

page, I beg your pardon.

To get our bearings, we'll come back to this in a moment, but we see in handwriting at the top, "Sunday Herald 26/7/15" and we'll see that this appears to be page 3 of that newspaper. If we could scroll onto the next page of the PDF, please, because I think these two

1 pages are maybe the wrong way around. Here we are. The Sunday Herald, we see 26/7/2015 page 2 and there's a 2 3 special report and if we scroll down just to get an idea 4 of this, we see a quotation from, I think, Kadi and if 5 we scroll to the bottom of that page we see: "Family of Sheku Bayoh launch campaign calling for 6 7 answers over his death in police custody." And we can see that there's the text box and an 8 image, but otherwise the special report covers all of 9 10 that page of the newspaper, if we can scroll to the bottom of that page just to get a sense of that, thank 11 12 you, and because the pages were back to front, if we 13 could please go to the first page of that PDF, page 3 14 I think of the PDF, which is also page 3 of The Sunday 15 Herald. So we see here that this is essentially a two-page 16 17 spread covering pages 2 and 3 of The Sunday Herald and 18 page 2 is taken up with the special report plus an image and a text box and on page 3 there's another image and 19 20 we can see the concluding paragraphs of the special 21 report and also the final two columns on the right-hand 22 side have the heading "Sheku Bayoh death in police custody: the unanswered questions". 23 So it would appear that the journalist, it's the 24 25 same journalist who drafted the special report, a

1		Judith Duffy, has summarised in the final two columns on
2		page 3 of The Sunday Herald a number of unanswered
3		questions. If we could scroll down a little, please.
4		Perfect. I should say I'm working from these newspaper
5		articles because we don't have a copy of the text of
6		what was said by you at the launch of the family's
7		campaign. I don't know whether you might have a copy of
8		that, Mr Anwar, whether it was prepared in advance as a
9		printed statement that was perhaps issued to the press
10		and, if so, if it might be possible for us to have a
11		copy. It's certainly not in with the press releases.
12	Α.	I could have a look for that to see if there is a copy.
13	Q.	That would be appreciated, thank you.
14		For today's purposes we'll work with what has been
15		printed in the press following the launch of the family
16		campaign, Justice for Sheku Bayoh, and the statement
17		that you made on 25th. So this is Judith Duffy's list
18		of unanswered questions and we see a number of
19		bulletpoints and I would like to look at the first two.
20		The first one:
21		"No knife was found. In the immediate aftermath of
22		Sheku Bayoh's death, reports suggested that the police

responded to a call of a man brandishing a knife and the earliest reports were that a female police officer had been stabbed, but the Bayoh family solicitor,

1 Aamer Anwar, said it has now been established that when 2 the police arrived, Sheku not carrying a knife, not was 3 one found on him." 4 And I wanted to ask what the source of that 5 information was that you've put into the public domain that Sheku had not been carrying a knife at the time 6 7 that the police arrived and that no knife had been found on him? 8 Well, the family had spoken to people at the time who 9 10 lived around Hayfield Road, so they were also a source. The crown and the PIRC, provided that information to the 11 12 family. Why did you choose to put that information into the 13 Q. 14 public domain? 15 What was the date of this report? Α. This is 26th. It was the day of -- July 2015. It was 16 Q. the day after the launch of the family campaign. 17 18 So by that point in time we had been from May, June and Α. July and the family were growing increasingly frustrated 19 20 with the press reports that were appearing, the attacks 21 on the family, the attempt to paint a narrative to 22 stereotype, to criminalise and to blame Sheku for his own death. So the family felt that they needed to 23 defend, because the starting point of course was the 24 25 police source said that a police officer was stabbed.

The way the narrative was framed as though they didn't miss out the -- Mr Watson's narrative or Brian Docherty's narrative or Calum Steele's narrative always missed out that Sheku was unarmed when the police arrived and that was critical importance, because of course Sheku was seen with a knife earlier on, but there was no knife when the police arrived but people assumed he had a knife and that was the starting point.

So for the family they felt it was important to defend Sheku in his death. Sheku couldn't speak for himself, but they wanted to speak to that and say he didn't stab anyone, he didn't brandish a knife at the police officers. So for all extent and purposes, when the police arrived, he could have been any black man walking down the street. There are of course, despite what some police officers may have said, lots of black people who stay in Kirkaldy. So how did they know, instead of saying, let's drive the van at him or jump out of the van with CS spray, Pava spray and just go at him, as they did from the offset, no attempt to de-escalate.

So that was important for the family to have that out in the public domain to set the record straight and,

I have to say, the family and myself were growing increasingly frustrated with the lack of professionalism

and the inability to investigate all the things we were saying to the PIRC and to the Lord Advocate. What about this? What about that? And it just seemed to be, you know, even in terms of the weight, big deal made about Sheku's weight, we kept asking what was the weight of the officers? Normal common sense if you've got a man who's lying down on the ground, I would ask what's the weight of the people on top of him? So the family wanted to defend Sheku in his death.

Q. Let's look at the next bulletpoint:

"Why did officers believe they were dealing with a terrorist threat? The families say they have established that police believed they were dealing with a terrorist threat when they attended the incident involving Bayoh. They want to know why this was the case and whether that had any role in his subsequent treatment."

Again, what was the source of that information?

A. I think material appeared in the newspapers, the language that was used, and also, obviously, the crown and the PIRC spoke to the family and the question the family of course asked was, had it been a white man walking down the street, would they have instantly thought, we might be dealing a terrorist attack, would they have mentioned Lee Rigby on a Sunday morning in

1		Kirkaldy? Absolutely not, the family didn't believe it
2		and they wanted, again, to say stop building a narrative
3		to justify the death of Sheku Bayoh.
4	Q.	Can we jump to another article now, please. There's
5		another point that I would like to ask you about that
6		doesn't feature, for whatever reason, in this particular
7		news report. I wonder if we can go to SBPI 00709 which
8		is a Guardian article actually published on 25 July.
9		I think it must have been an online article. It's
10		fairly lengthy. If we could scroll down to the third
11		paragraph, please:
12		"Aamer Anwar, the civil rights lawyer acting for
13		Bayoh's family, said at a press conference on
14		Saturday "
15		And I think, in fact, 25 July was a Saturday and I
16		think, again, this is a reference to a statement made by
17		you at the launch of the Justice for Sheku Bayoh
18		Campaign on 25; would that seem to be correct?
19	A.	I believe so.
20	Q.	Okay. Let's scroll down, please, to the second page.
21		Four paragraphs down there's a quotation here from
22		something you said at the press conference:
23		"'The family has known for weeks that the first
24		actions of the officers attending on meeting Sheku was
25		to use CS spray, was to use Pava spray (a form of pepper

- spray), was to raise their batons, yet at that point

  Sheku had done nothing', the lawyer told the press
- 3 conference."
- And again, I wanted to ask what was the source of that information?
- A. Through the family who had spoken to members of the public who lived on Hayfield Road, the crown and the PIRC and, of course, information that was regularly appearing in the media.
- 10 Q. Okay, and what was the purpose of putting that
  11 information into the public domain?
- 12 Α. The family by that point, the relationship had become 13 restrained with the PIRC and they felt they were not 14 investigating fully, they felt under attack from the 15 Scottish Police Federation and felt the need that they had to defend Sheku in his death and actually set out 16 17 the narrative as it was, rather than that Sheku just 18 went on a violent and unprovoked attack in an attempt to 19 murder a police officer, when the reality was he was the 20 one in a mental health crisis who needed help and he was 21 attacked and attacked and attacked before 22 he did something.
- Q. Can we return to your statement, please, and look at
  paragraph 242. In this paragraph you refer to a letter
  that you received from the deputy crown agent,

Lindsey Miller, on 8 June 2020. You provided the doc 1 ID, but you have also quoted the text verbatim in your 2 3 statement so let's work with your statement: 4 "Over the last few days I have seen public comment 5 and social media stating that Sheku Bayoh said 'I can't breathe' in the context of comparison to recent reports 6 7 about the death in Minneapolis of George Floyd. In particular, Collette Bell was reported in the Daily 8 9 Record, published on 4 June 2020, as saying 10 'George Floyd stated 'I can't breathe', so good Sheku.' Further, in a BBC News interview broadcast on 4 June, 11 12 your client Sheku's sister Kadi Johnson, made an 13 identical comparison, also attributing the words 14 'I can't breathe' to Sheku just before he passed away. 15 "I was extremely surprised and concerned to hear of these remarks in advance of the public inquiry when none 16 17 of the witness statements or other evidence in 18 possession of the crown contains any reference to Sheku 19 saying to police officers 'I can't breathe.' You'll be 20 aware of the evidential significance of such a remark, 21 had it been made, and of the importance of highlighting 22 such evidence to the experts instructed by the crown. "I should be grateful if you would advise me of the 23 evidential origin of these remarks that have been made 24 to the press and other media in order that these can be 25

1		investigated further."
2		Now, if we can scroll to the top of that paragraph,
3		please. In the first paragraph of the letter there's a
4		reference to public comment in social media and I would
5		like at this juncture to show you a Tweet. This is
6		SBPI 00705. So if we can pause here, that looks to be a
7		photograph of you. Has this come from your Twitter
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	(as it then was) account? It doesn't appear to have
10		a date-stamp on it, but it relates to the death of
11		George Floyd. He died on 25 May 2020 so it must be some
12		point after 25 May 2020 that the Tweet was posted.
13		Let's read what it says:
14		"All those horrified at scene of a black man,
15		George Floyd, dying as he struggled to breathe whilst
16		being knelt on by a police officer, should also remember
17		Sheku Bayoh who said 'I can't breathe' whilst being held
18		down by officers until he died in Kirkaldy, Scotland,
19		3 May 2015."
20		And then there's a body map showing the location of
21		injuries and what I think might be a still from the
22		Ashley Wyse footage or certainly from Hayfield Road. Is
23		this a Tweet that was sent by you, Mr Anwar?
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	Undated but following the death of George Floyd, what

1 was the purpose of you posting this Tweet? 2 It was to point out the comparisons between the death of Α. 3 George Floyd and that whilst people in Scotland, police 4 officers, politicians were all busy taking the knee and 5 talking about Black Lives Matter, it seemed hypocritical for me the fact that we had a black man by the name of 6 7 Sheku Bayoh that people didn't even know about or weren't discussing and pointing out the comparisons and 8 9 the similarities of what had taken place. In Sheku's 10 case, of course, it was at least five officers that were involved in restraining him and putting him to the 11 12 ground. Now, you state in the Tweet, if we could scroll down a 13 Q. 14 wee bit, please: 15 "Sheku Bayoh who said 'I can't breathe' whilst being held down by officers." 16 What was the source of that information? 17 So I think the source of that information fundamentally, 18 Α. 19 first of all, came from Ade Johnson, who in 2015 had 20 with -- I think members of his family had been going 21 down Hayfield Road trying to gather information and 22 collect evidence. We relayed that information to the crown in a meeting. The person who also heard that 23 24 information was April Meechan, who works in my firm,

he's a consultant, senior consultant, and also

25

Dorothy Bane KC, who is the present Lord Advocate, who was our counsel for several years.

We relayed that information in a meeting with the crown and then following that, that was in 2015 and I have been accused of many things in my time, but I think the exact words of Ade Johnson was that the witness had said to him that he had met was -- said the words "Get off me, I can't breathe", and we have heard evidence in this court of one witness at least who said that she heard him saying, "get off me", hearing screams that sent chills through her body.

And then after that what happened was in -- on 19 February 2019, in the victim's right to review, which was prepared by myself, by April Meechan and the present Lord Advocate, I believe -- I don't have the document in front of me, I haven't looked at it for a long time, but I think at page 20 there was reference to those remarks and it was placed in the VRR, so a long time before George Floyd died and of course nobody batted an eyelid at Crown Office, when we said about Ade having met someone and this person having said it. Nobody saw it as controversial.

And why would it have been controversial, because if you have got five people on top of someone and he's struggling and he's screaming, "get off me" and if he

1 says "I can't breathe", you would expect that, because of course he was fighting for his breath -- last breath 2 and it only became controversial to the institutions, to 3 4 the Crown Office and to Peter Watson, who was the one 5 who wrote to the Crown Office in exactly the same terms 6 and then the Crown Office wrote to us, it only became 7 controversial to them because all of a sudden they thought Aamer is making this up, Aamer is playing the 8 race card, Aamer is trying to get the bandwagon rolling 9 10 on George Floyd. Well, actually, no, because it started in 2015, but 11 12 nobody cared in 2015, '16, '17, '18, '19 and then, of 13 course, in 2020, all of a sudden, it becomes a big issue 14 and I never received an apology from Lindsey Miller when 15 it was pointed out to her, did you even bother to read the VRR before accusing me of doing this? 16 So you say this was information that you received from 17 Q. Ade Johnson back in 2015. You also say the information 18 19 was passed on to the Crown Office at a meeting; was that meeting in 2015? 20 21 That meeting was in 2015 and I remember at that stage Α.

A. That meeting was in 2015 and I remember at that stage what happened was members of the public had complained about a black man coming to the door trying to collect information, the PIRC contacted me, I then -- again, at that point in time, it was early on in the summer of

22

23

24

25

1 2015, I think, I don't remember the exact date, I said 2 to Ade and to the family you need to stay away, do not 3 interfere with a live investigation, you could prejudice 4 it, we don't want you having contact, let the PIRC get 5 on with their jobs. Of course, subsequent to that then the family came 6 7 back to me because we find out that the Scottish Police Federation, John Sallens, working on behalf of 8 Peter Watson, were busy going door to door making 9 10 allegations against Sheku Bayoh and they weren't being stopped, but I had told the family robustly, back off, 11 12 let the investigation get on with its job, and that was 13 at that time that Ade met with that witness. Q. We should understand that at some point in 2015 14 15 Ade Johnson had been approaching people who lived on Hayfield Road --16 17 Α. Yes. 18 -- looking for information about the circumstances of Q. 19 Sheku's death. 20 Α. Yes. 21 So you had this information in 2015. It was provided to Q. 22 Crown Office officials at a meeting in 2015, at which both Dorothy Bane and April Meechan were also present? 23 It was provided, firstly, to myself, to April Meechan 24 Α. 25 and to Dorothy Bane and then I think we had a meeting --

1 I can't remember who else was in the meeting, I think Dorothy may not have been there, but the point was Ade 2 was there and this information was provided in the 3 4 presence of the family. So it was something that was. 5 But nobody thought it was controversial, nobody is interested in the family saying "can't breathe", because 6 7 you already had witnesses saying "get off me", "sent chills through my body", "screaming like an animal". It 8 wasn't a big deal, it became a big deal later. They 9 10 went "How did you do that?" and I went "Why don't you go and check? About a year before we said to you in the 11 12 VRR and you didn't make a point about it then." But 13 George Floyd dies and all of a sudden the words "I can't breathe" is something that reflects of what every black 14 15 person who has died in police custody has felt when multiple police officers have restrained them. Of 16 course they can't breathe, what else happens? I know it 17 18 when I have got little children and I say to them -- to the oldest ones "Get off the wee one. They can't 19 20 breathe." It's automatic. A trained police officer who 21 have known that, but for them this was controversial. 22 There was nothing controversial about it until after 2020. 23 24 Q. Coming back to the meeting in 2015 with the Crown Office, who was at the meeting from the 25

1		Crown Office side?
2	Α.	I'm trying to think, but I don't know if it was
3		I think Lindsey Miller may have been there, Les Brown
4		and I don't know if the Lord Advocate at that time had
5		changed to James Wolffe, but I think those individuals
6		would have been there.
7	Q.	Okay. The letter of course drew your attention to the
8		evidential significance of the statement and asked that
9		you advise the origin of the remarks that the
10		Crown Office could investigate further, but your
11		evidence is that that information was provided back in
12		2015 and you also refer to the VRR.
13		So just to get our bearings here, I wonder if we can
14		look at the VRR. It has been heavily redacted, because
15		our terms of reference don't permit us to examine that
16		process, but I wonder if we can look, firstly, at the
17		email to which the VRR was attached. That's
18		COPFS 03106. So this is an email sent on
19		1 February 2019:
20		"Subject: VRR made on behalf of the family of
21		Sheku Bayoh."
22		It's not clear who issued the email. The name has
23		been redacted. Would that however have been issued by
24		your office?
25	А.	I think it would have been the secretary of my office

1	and, sorry, I apologise, I got the date wrong. It was
2	1 February 2019 not 19 February 2019.
3 Q.	Okay. And we see that it's been sent to Les Brown and
4	the secretary for the Lord Advocate, the secretary for
5	the Solicitor General, Lindsey Miller and others:
6	"Good afternoon, everyone. I enclose here with VRR
7	template with supporting application form an attached
8	document with reason set out requesting a review into
9	the decision not to take proceedings against officers of
10	Police Scotland in relation to the death of
11	Sheku Bayoh."
12	So my purpose in look at this email is just to get
13	the date-stamp, because I believe that the paperwork
14	attached is undated, but we can see here that it was
15	submitted on 1 February 2019.
16	Let's now have a look at the VRR paperwork,
17	COPFS 00199. Again, this has been heavily redacted.
18	Just to get our bearings, we can see from the title at
19	the top:
20	"Request for a review of a decision not to
21	prosecute, section 4 of the Victims and Witnesses
22	(Scotland) Act 2014 on behalf of the family of
23	Mr Bayoh."
24	And if we can scroll to the bottom of page 19,
25	please, so "AJ", is that Ade Johnston?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	"Ade Johnson attended at locus later and took
3		photographs of area, which we have, spoke with residents
4		on street, believes lady at Hayfield Road may have heard
5		SB saying 'Get off me. I can't breathe'."
6		So we see a written record here of that information
7		being provided in the VRR on 1 February 2019 and that of
8		course was a year before more than a year before
9		George Floyd's death.
LO		Now, what's recorded here, Mr Anwar, is that Ade
L1		believes that a lady at Hayfield Road may have heard
L2		Sheku Bayoh saying 'Get off me, I can't breathe'. The
13		Tweet suggests that Sheku Bayoh did as a matter of fact
L 4		say "I can't breathe" and I wonder what steps you took
15		to confirm that the information that we see here in the
16		VRR was accurate before putting it in the public domain?
L7	Α.	Well, in the first instance, Ade Johnson had met with
L8		the resident. He had told me that was his belief that
19		that's what was said. We've heard evidence from a
20		witness that came to this Inquiry that said that
21		Sheku Bayoh had said "get off me". I then had to take
22		the position with the family after hearing from the PIRC
23		and the Lord Advocate's Office to tell them to step away
24		and to back off.

At the time, I told the family, don't worry, the

25

PIRC will carry out an investigation, they will revisit
the investigation, they will go door to door. Of
course, many years later we found out they never
bothered. So there was a belief that they would get
around to doing that. We were unaware until years later
when we got disclosure provided, that they never
bothered with visiting civilian witnesses again. So as
far as I was concerned, Ade Johnson wasn't making it up,
because how could he know. He couldn't predict that in
four years' time George Floyd would die and say "I can't
breathe". He said the words "Get off me. I can't
breathe". That's what he said and I took that as what
he had heard from the witness and of course the
witnesses came.

Now, witnesses --all of us as lawyers are

Now, witnesses --all of us as lawyers are experienced to know witnesses will remember some things many years later and other things they won't remember, but it wasn't controversial and that's the gist of this. The injuries on Sheku, what happened to him, the petechial hemorrhages in his eyes, the restraint that was used on him, the force that was used on him, the overwhelming force was on him, the screams that were heard, "get off me", if he said at the words "I can't breathe", what else would you expect him to say?

Nothing controversial.

- Q. This is a record of a conversation that Ade had had with the lady?
- As I said in my opening statement, Ade has been through 3 Α. 4 a great deal over the years. Ade took a statement. He 5 took -- he's not a precognition officer, he's not a lawyer, he's a member of the public who was fighting for 6 7 justice for his dead brother-in-law, who he treated as a brother. He went to that door. And I watched Ade 8 9 suffer a great deal and I asked him and the family 10 moved, of course, as I said, from Kirkaldy, they put stuff into and they tried to find material and stuff 11 12 that was written down, but I said not to worry, the PIRC 13 is carrying out investigation, they'll go to the doors, they'll get this information. Of course they didn't. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As far as I'm concerned, the statements that were taken by the PIRC of civilian witnesses were amateur, amateur. This was not investigation into a death in custody. It was totally amateur hour from the PIRC and they failed to get at the correct information from witnesses.

Q. Okay. So I understand there wasn't a statement from this witness for whatever reason and that what we are going on here is information provided verbally to Ade. It might be suggested that Ade believes the lady may have heard Sheku Bayoh saying, "Get off me, I can't

- 1 breathe", is perhaps different from Sheku Bayoh said
- 2 "I can't breathe," which is what was recorded in your
- 3 Tweet and I wonder if I could invite your comment on
- 4 that difference?
- 5 A. Well, Twitter has only a certain amount of characters.
- 6 Anybody who uses Twitter would know that. You have a
- 7 certain amount of character before Elon Musk took over
- 8 and you could extend the number of characters. That is
- 9 the first thing in Twitter you can put down a few lines
- and you take the crux about the words were "I can't
- 11 breathe". I didn't of course put in -- I didn't have
- 12 enough space on Twitter to say "She heard screams that
- sent chills through her body, screaming like an animal
- and he said 'get off me, I can't breathe'" so the words
- were "I can't breathe".
- 16 Q. Okay. Am I right to understand that the Tweet was later
- 17 taken down or deleted?
- 18 A. I don't know. I don't remember. I think -- I think I
- 19 have read that but --
- Q. I can't assist us with --
- 21 A. I don't know.
- Q. You don't know.
- A. I don't know.
- Q. All right. okay.
- 25 A. But what I can say to you is this is that that was yet

again another example to say that I was a liar and that I was making things up and Lindsey Miller got the VRR and she didn't even notice that on 1 February 2019 she was provided those words, I didn't just make it up on the hoof in July 2020, it was said there. And the fact that they chose not to take notes at so many meetings that we had wasn't my fault, wasn't the family's fault and they seem to forget, I was working pro-bono, I had no resources to sit there with an army of lawyers noting down every single word, typing it down or anything. It was me going into meetings with them, with the family.

- Q. Now, notwithstanding the word limitation on Twitter certainly at that time, I wonder whether, with the benefit of hindsight, you might like to reflect on whether there was a sound basis for attributing the words "I can't breathe" to Sheku Bayoh, given what we see here in the VRR is that Ade believes that a lady may have heard Sheku Bayoh saying "get off me, I can't breathe"? The tone is somewhat less certain in what's recorded in the VRR than the tone of what is said in the Tweet.
- A. No, I think it's -- I think it's worse, because Ade says she said "get off me, I can't breathe", and "screams that sent chills through my body", so I think actually if I had had more words, could have added to the fact

that this is what Sheku faced. The words "I can't breathe" were pretty simple in comparison to what Sheku Bayoh endured that day.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Let's return to your statement, please. And I wonder if we can look at paragraph 196. I'm interested in the bottom part of the paragraph, but let's look at it very quickly just to have some context:

"That's the issue here for the family: that they used the CS spray; they used the Pava spray; they used the batons; and all I can see the actions of a young black man as he is walking open-palmed towards them and he keeps walking. He doesn't do anything, and it's on the fourth or fifth occasion that he lashes out, but even then, he's down on the ground. Remove yourself from his body. He's struggling. He's crying out. He's making a noise that sends chills through one of the witnesses: 'Never heard a scream like that'. Once the police have got him handcuffed, get off him. Why do they persist? Are he not trained? Do they not knowing about positional asphyxiation? The whole focus has been on drugs and cardiac arrest. That was the be all and end all for them. We pushed and pushed on positional asphyxiation. We pushed and pushed with the PIRC on the basis of that. The biomechanics, the whole way his chest is being pushed into a hard ground. We could see

1 it. Nat Carey could see it. Professor Crane could see 2 it. There's no need to lie on top of him. There's no need to teach 'the boy' a lesson, that was the insulting 3 4 terms they referred to him as. Because that's what this 5 all is. 'He went after one of us, a white female officer. We had to teach him a lesson.'" 6 7 I'll stop there because that is the bit that I'm interested in. It's the part in quotation there: 8 9 "He went after one of us, a white female officer. We had to teach him a lesson." 10 And there's also a reference to teaching "the boy" a 11 12 lesson. Both of these phrases are in quotation marks. 13 I wondered whether these quotations had come from? "The boy" comes from the reference to Sheku Bayoh 14 Α. 15 disparagingly in many of the police witnesses' statements. I don't remember which police officers 16 17 were, but they referred to him as a boy, and the first 18 thing was -- I spoke to my team because I said use of a 19 boy for a black man, anyone who is black, they would 20 know in the United States is regularly used in a 21 demeaning and racist manner. You could be 60 years old, 22 you could be 70 years old, you could be a professor of law, you could be a surgeon and a police officer would 23 call you "boy" and the same thing is translated in this 24 country. And I thought he wasn't a boy. Some of the 25

police officers that referred to him were actually 1 younger than Sheku Bayoh. So that was the word "the 2 3 boy", that the family found insulting. "He went after one of us ... We had to teach him a 4 5 lesson," I'm not sure where that comes from. It's not somebody who has said that. That is not somebody has 6 7 said that. I'm saying this is what it felt like for the family. "He went after one of us, a white female 8 9 officer. We had to teach him a lesson." "It was the petite female officer that was attacked." Of course, 10 when Mr Watson refers to "the petite female officer", 11 12 that would have been murdered had it no been for the 13 interventions of other officers, he fails to mention she 14 is a police officer, a trained police officer, with 15 batons and weapons and there is full back up on the way and batons and CS spray and Pava spray of course have 16 been used. She's still a police officers. 17 Q. So "He went after one of us, a white female officer. We 18 19 had to teach him a lesson", just to be clear, you're not 20 attributing that as a quotation to any of the officers 21 who attended Hayfield Road or indeed anyone else? 22 You're saying that was the family's take of events? No, I haven't typed the statement up, so I'm not 23 Α. attributing that to any police officer. That's what the 24 25 family felt this was about.

Q. Okay. I would like to move on to another subject. Can 1 we look at paragraph 141 of your statement, please: 2 3 "I have been asked about my knowledge of the creating and viewing of intelligence logs held by 4 5 Police Scotland under my name with the subject term REFRACT, used for submission of counterterrorism 6 7 intelligence and when I became aware of this. I was unaware of any details being held; I had always 8 9 suspected that I had been placed on numerous occasions 10 through my life because of cases that I was involved in that meant conflict with the police. The first time I 11 12 became aware was when the Inquiry last year told me they 13 had discovered this material in disclosure. Following 14 that I met with ACC Alan Speirs and was shown minimal 15 paperwork at the police HQ. They tried to explain it off by saying they were not allowed to show me the 16 17 information but some of it related to death threats to me. This was not satisfactory, but I also was unwilling 18 for the police to be sidetracked into me rather than 19 20 Sheku's death -- I thought when the time arises then I 21 would deal with it." And if we carry on, please, onto 142: 22 "I have been asked whether I was aware that COPFS 23 had referred this matter to the Information 24 Commissioner's Office. I was not aware that the matter 25

was referred by COPFS to the ICO, after all I was led to 1 believe there was no information stored on me or the 2 3 family." 4 And you go on to say that in paragraph 143 that 5 there not been a public inquiry you wouldn't have know anything about it. And I wanted to ask you if you could 6 7 describe the impact on you of learning that the police held intelligence logs in which the term "REFRACT", 8 9 which the Inquiry has heard is a term associated with 10 counterterrorism intelligence was associated with your 11 name? 12 Α. I was shocked, I was angry, and I felt vulnerable. It 13 was Imran Khan, the lawyer for Doreen Lawrence, 14 Imran Khan KC, who said to me at the start in May, he 15 said put in a letter to the Crown Office and ask him to see that there has not been any checks or information 16 17 gathered on the family and then Imran said to me at the end he says, "Don't forget to add your name?" I said 18 "Why my name? It's the family I'm interested in" and 19 20 Imran said because that's what they did to him and he 21 says "You need to check." 22 So of course when that was put in, it came back saying there is nothing found, nothing at all, which 23 wasn't true, because of course there was a file kept on 24 me and from that I can only gather from what I have 25

seen, some information that I'm not allowed to refer to, 1 that I was the subject of targeted surveillance, I was 2 3 subjected to files kept on me and information that 4 should not have been kept on me and that begs the 5 question, and I have said it before, if this was a white lawyer doing the job that I was doing, would that be 6 7 acceptable or would there be a massive uproar and outrage in this country from lawyers, from the legal 8 9 establishment, from the Law Society, from the Faculty of Advocates, from the government? 10 I believe there would be, but for some reason, 11 12 because it's Aamer Anwar involved in the death of a 13 black man, there wasn't really any outrage, it didn't 14 really matter and of course at around about that time 15 Police Scotland were also found to have engaged in unlawful activity in relation to the case of Emma 16 17 Caldwell, of course who I act for the family of Emma Caldwell. So all these years later I find this all 18 out, same names popping up, same individuals. 19 20 I knew DCC Ruaraidh Nicolson for a number of years, 21 because of course Ruaraidh who I know as "Rory", had 22 been the one who had provided me support and officers when my life was under threat, but I was never once told 23 this was going on behind the scenes. 24

So I saw myself as a target of surveillance and a

25

1 target of unlawful activity by the police, but when I 2 was approached by the Inquiry, I had to make a decision 3 and I remember speaking to the rest of my legal team. I 4 said -- again, I said, I cannot become the focus of this 5 Inquiry, I cannot be sidetracked, I cannot decide to take legal action, because it's a diversion. The focus 6 7 must remain Sheku Bayoh, but now here and now I am angry, I am upset that why I should be placed in that 8 9 position, that sort of whispering campaign, local 10 activity. Police officers up and down this country, how many of them have viewed these logs? What is it they 11 12 are looking for? What have I done wrong? Nothing 13 absolutely nothing.

- Q. Did you make a complaint?
- 15 Did I make a complaint? No, because as I said, I am Α. used to over 25 years I've said I have never once 16 17 publicly complained to anyone about that my treatment that I have suffered at the hands of Crown Office, at 18 19 the hands of the police, at the hands of the Scottish 20 Police Federation. I may well have taken advice from 21 people, but I have chosen not to complain, because I did 22 not want to sidetracked into complaining about myself, because it has to be, as Imran and Michael Mansfield 23 said, "keep your eyes on the prize, keep your eyes on 24 the family, keep your eyes on the victim and do not be 25

1		baited by them".
2	Q.	I would like to move on to something else now, Mr Anwar.
3		And I would like us to discuss the evidence given by
4		Alistair Lewis, who was the family liaison officer for
5		the PIRC. He gave evidence on 8 February of this year
6		and he completed his evidence on 1 March of this year,
7		That was Day 78, and 87, and you may recall on Day 78 he
8		was taken to the FLO log in which there is a record made
9		by him of a telephone call with you timestamped
L 0		17:48 hours on 4 May 2015, written up at 16:45 hours on
11		5 May.
L2		So what I would like to do is begin by bringing that
L3		logbook up on the screen, it's PIRC 04150, so that we
L 4		can remind ourselves the content of the entry and then I
L5		will remind you of what Mr Lewis had to say about this
L6		entry before I turn to ask you some questions.
L7		So I think we'll find this on page 18 of the FLO
18		log, and so if we stop is there, we see the timestamp
19		17:48 hours on 4.5.15 and if we look at the entry
20		<pre>itself:</pre>
21		"Advised Aamer Anwar of result of PM unascertained
22		death, subject to toxicology and brain tissue exam.
23		Asked who the pathologist had been. Unaware at that
24		time. At the time of the call Aamer had his children
25		with him Also asked if he could obtain GP details for

1		the PIRC to obtain medical records of Sheku for
2		pathologist."
3		And if we scroll down just a little bit to see the
4		date and time of the writeup, written up at 16.45 hours
5		on 5 May, 2015. If we could put the content of that
6		entry on the screen again, please, and we'll leave that
7		there, and what I'll do, Mr Anwar, is read out the
8		evidence that Mr Lewis gave in connection with this
9		entry. Please bear with me, it's a reasonably lengthy
10		passage, but you'll be aware when it comes to the
11		evidence I can't bring that up on the screen, I'll
12		simply read it out to you.
13	Α.	Okay.
14	Q.	He was asked:
15		"Question: Where were you when you made this call to
16		Mr Anwar?
17		Answer: Kirkaldy Police Office out in the backyard
18		away from privacy.
19		Question: The entry says 'advised result of PM
20		unascertained, subject to toxicology and brain tissue
21		exam.' How did Mr Anwar react to that information?
22		Answer: As it says there, he asked who the
23		pathologist had been and I told him I was unaware at the
24		time.
25		Questions: And beyond asking about the pathologist,

did he have any reaction to you sharing with him the
results of the autopsy?
Answer: No.
Question: You said in your second Inquiry
statement, paragraph 75:
'Aamer certainly didn't express any surprise when I
told him the PM had been completed. There is no
surprise.
Answer: That is correct.
Question: You have recorded in the entry that at
the time of the call he had his children with him. How
did you know that?
Answer: I could hear in the background and we had a
bit of conversation about children and looking after
them, et cetera. That was just a bit of professional
courtesy between both of us.
Question: You say 'children' rather than 'child',
were you able to tell how many children were with him?
Answer: I could hear the children in the background
and I probably would have said to him, is it a good time
to speak to him and he told me he was out with his
children at the time and was it okay to continue with
the conversation.
Question: Did he say where he was?
Answer: No, I don't think so.

1	Question: Did you have an impression as to what he
2	was doing with the children.
3	Answer: Me, other than a father spending time with
4	children, no.
5	Question: Why did you record in the full log that he
6	had his children with him? Did you think that was a
7	relevant detail that he was worth noting down?
8	Answer: I could hear in the background that the
9	children were there, so I was just making sure it was a
10	safe environment to talk to him about these
11	circumstances. That's all.
12	Question: It was 17.48, which is after the end of
13	the typical working day.
14	Answer: Yes.
15	Question: Given that he had his children with him
16	and you said he was out somewhere with them, did you
17	form any impression as to whether he was able to give
18	you and the call his full attention at that time?
19	Answer: He said he could, so I wouldn't have
20	continued the conversation. If he has said phone me
21	back, I would have done that.
22	Question: You recorded that he asked you to obtain
23	the details of Mr Bayoh's GP.
24	Answer: Yes, to obtain the medical records.
25	Question: And how did he respond to that request?

1	Answer: I can't remember. I think he said he would
2	go back to the family to be 100 per cent certain.
3	I couldn't be specific about the response."
4	So that was Mr Lewis' evidence about that particular
5	entry and I know that was quite a lot information to
6	give you. It's with a view to refreshing your memory
7	both of the entry and of the evidence that he gave.
8	Now, you were of course sent a Rule 8 request in
9	which you were invited to comment on the entry in the
LO	logbook and we had that to hand. We received your
L1	response before Mr Lewis gave his evidence and I think
L2	it might be helpful at this juncture to bring up on the
L3	screen your response to that Rule 8 request. It's SBPI
L 4	00453.
L5	So we see this is on your headed notepaper and it's
L6	a response to the Rule 8 and you have helpfully copied
L7	over each of the questions before then providing your
18	response. So we've refreshed our memory of the entry in
L9	the logbook and what Mr Lewis had to say about that
20	entry in his oral evidence. What I would like to do now
21	is take you through each of the questions and answers
22	and then ask you some questions.
23	So the first question reads:
24	"Alistair Lewis PIRC FLO recorded in the FLO log
25	that he had a telephone call with you at 17.48 on

4 May 2015." 1 2 Now, at this moment can I just pause and say there's 3 a reference here to 4 May, I think that should actually 4 be 3rd, rather than the 4th. I think that's just been a 5 typo, but may I take it that from the context you were clear what you were being asked about when you --6 7 Sorry, so ... okay, 3 May. Is it 4 May I received the Α. call? 8 Sorry, I beg your pardon, that's my error. I beg your 9 Q. 10 pardon. I think in actual fact when I went back and looked at the Rule 8 request there was a reference to 11 12 the 3 May. 13 Yes. Α. And you corrected that? 14 Q. 15 Α. Yes. Is that right? 16 Q. That's correct. 17 Α. Do you have the Rule 8 request there? 18 Q. 19 I have the Rule 8 here and I corrected, because it said Α. 20 I received a call at 17.48 on 3 May and I said, no, it 21 would have been 4 May. Thank you. I'm getting myself in a muddle. So there 22 Q. had been an inadvertent typo in the Rule 8 request that 23 was sent to you and albeit you copied over the question 24

into your response, you corrected the error, and you

25

1		amended it from 3rd to 4th. But just for the avoidance
2		of doubt, were you clear from the question, even though
3		the date was wrong, what it was you were being asked
4		about?
5	Α.	Yes.
6	Q.	There then follows the text of the log. We've read that
7		out already so we can skip over that and if we could
8		scroll down, please, here is the first question that you
9		were asked:
10		"Did you receive a call from Mr Lewis at 17:48 on
11		3 May?"
12		There we are, that's the error there, I knew it was
13		there somewhere. It should have been the 4th. And your
14		reply was:
15		"I had already been told on 4 May by the family that
16		they wished the postmortem to be put on hold and Ade had
17		told the PIRC that they wished it delayed until
18		Mrs Bayoh had arrived and she had seen Sheku. In
19		conversation with Alistair Lewis, this was reiterated by
20		myself on 4 May that the PM would be on hold for him to
21		claim that he told me the postmortem had gone ahead
22		makes no sense."
23		So can I begin just by being absolutely clear
24		whether you did in fact receive a call from Mr Lewis at
25		17.48 on 4 May?

I don't remember if I received the call at exactly 17:48 on 4 May, it is a long time ago, I remember I received a call from Mr Lewis, and he was told in no uncertain terms put the postmortem on hold because Aminata Bayoh, Sheku's mother, was travelling up and the family wanted the postmortem -- and wasn't controversial. It was like that's fine and also I think in that conversation I said I would be speaking with the Lord Advocate, Frank Mulholland, now Lord Mulholland.

So that's 100 per cent my recollection so it's just simply not true and it makes no sense and of course his notes were written up, as you said, I think on 16:45 on 5 May. They weren't written up at the time. They were written the day after when all hell lets loose after I have spoken to the Lord Advocate who then has to call me back and apologise and say he didn't know.

Q. As I said a moment ago, we received your response to the Rule 8 before Mr Lewis gave his evidence and so we had the opportunity to put your responses to him and seek his comment so on Day 78 he was given the opportunity to read over this first question and answer and he was invited to comment and he said:

"In conversation with myself he didn't reiterate to me that the PM would be put on hold. It was later that day or later or it might have been the following day or

couple of days later that he told me the Lord Advocate

had indicated that the postmortem would be delayed and I

went back and that conversation I went back to this

previous, this phone call there, explaining the

postmortem and what I had told him that day."

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So that's his comment on your response and this is your opportunity to comment on that?

That makes absolutely no sense for Mr Lewis because he Α. knows fine well that on 5 May the family attend my office, I have not looked up the rest of the Rule 8 but on 5 May in the morning I contact Frank as I knew him at the time, now Lord Mulholland so no disrespect intended, Frank saying, "Can you contact me, this case has happened, I need to speak to you". Frank phones me back, "Postmortem will be kept on hold", wherein we say we're going to instruct Professor Busuttil. And of course then later on I think that morning when the family are there we get the phone call from the PIRC saying, "by the way the postmortem has taken place" and there's uproar in my office, the room, the family have at least ten members of the family there, and they're crying, and they're upset and screaming, "What do you mean the postmortem has taken place?" So it wouldn't make sense because Alistair Lewis or whoever it was phoned me at the time why didn't he say "but we told you, Mr Anwar,

1 the day before" and why is he saying "at least a day or a couple of days later" because he knows fine well the 2 3 Lord Advocate has gone back to say about the postmortem 4 and then he's subsequently told "actually the postmortem 5 has already taken place" and then there's a rush to go "Aamer's children must have somehow interfered with 6 7 this" or, you know, I'll write up my notes at 16.45 on 5 May because someone sometime is going to ask the 8 9 question "Why did you allow the postmortem to go ahead 10 and not tell the family?" because of course Mr Lewis could have told the family directly. I hadn't met with 11 12 the family. The family liaison officers were of course 13 communicating with the Sheku Bayoh family, that 14 relationship hadn't broken down, so why would they not 15 have told the family "by the way, the postmortem has taken place", after all they were speaking to the 16 17 family. Why are they saying that later in the evening 18 that they speak to me. It doesn't make sense and the 19 reason it doesn't make sense is because it's not the 20 truth. 21 Let's look at the second question that you were asked. Q. What I would like to do is go through each of the 22 questions and your responses to the questions and then 23 ask you some follow-up questions. So let's move on to 24

25

number 2.

"If yes [and this was in relation to whether you had received a call from him on evening of 4th] where were you at the time you received the call? What were you doing at the time you received the call? What was discussed during the call."

And you say:

"As above but it would have been normal for me to request the name of any pathologist so I could advise our pathologist in order that he could make arrangements to attend the PM."

So I want to just go back to the question really and ask you whether you recall where you were when you took the call?

A. No, I don't because of course we never saw any of this until, you know, eight, nine years later after Sheku's death, these notes were apparently written -- at the time they weren't of course written -- at the time they were written two days later so I don't recall, unlike Mr Lewis, exactly where he was at the time. I don't recall where I was but I do know that if I was receiving a call over Sheku Bayoh in the heat of that moment, then that was my priority because everything was dropped at the time in terms of that is a case from that moment on I remember the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, right up to the 14th May, the first press conference, I was at

1 this case nonstop gathering information, speaking to colleagues, trying to get help, what do we do, speaking 2 3 to the Lord Advocate, speaking to other individuals so 4 where I was at the time I don't know and it really 5 doesn't matter is the way I would view it because the 6 point is he didn't tell me the postmortem had taken 7 place, he didn't tell the family the postmortem had taken place and I asked the Lord Advocate the next 8 9 morning to put the postmortem on hold and the 10 Lord Advocate said he would do. Why would I ask the 11 Lord Advocate, Alistair Lewis? I mean in a conversation 12 that he's talked to me would I just forget conveniently 13 when I'm saying "I have been told by the family in the 14 phone call could you get the postmortem on hold". 15 I would phone back the family and say, "Listen, the 16 postmortem has taken place". At that time I would say 17 "I'm sorry, the postmortem has taken place", that would have been it but the fact that this has been construed 18 19 as the truth is just simply not truthful. Do you recall whether you had your children with you 20 Q. 21 when you took the call? 22 I don't recall, if I had my children with me, what day Α. of the week would that be? I think it was -- so 4 May 23 would have been a Bank Holiday, I think. 24 Q. Bank Holiday Monday, I think. 25

	1	Α.	Bank Holiday Monday but I don't recall if I had my
	2		children with me but in all honesty it would have not
	3		made any difference at all. My children are used to the
	4		fact of that I receive phone calls from morning to
	5		night. They complain often to me about it, but they're
	6		used to the fact that when the phone call comes in, it's
	7		like and even at that time they were younger so they
	8		would listen to me, I would be "shut up, be quiet" and
	9		they would be quiet. They're not quiet now but they
1	LO		were quiet at the time.

Q. All right. Let's return to your Rule 8:

"Question 3. Were you asked to obtain Sheku's GP details from the family so the PIRC could obtain the medical record for the pathologist? Given your experience as a criminal solicitor, did this request give any indication to you about the timing of the postmortem?"

And you say:

"From recollection, we would have wanted the GP's details, but that would not ever give me an indication of the time, especially as we were trying to arrange a time the following day so the family could attend first and of course Monday, 4th was a Bank Holiday. In my experience it's not necessarily the case that the PM will always taken place within the first 24 hours."

Ţ	There's nothing further I want to ask you in
2	relation to that statement. Let's move on to question
3	4.
4	"Do you accept any part of the FLO entry as
5	accurate?"
6	And you confirm, "asked if he could obtain GP
7	details for the PIRC."
8	You would agree with that, question 5, you say that
9	you dispute the remainder and you're unsure if the
10	matter with regard to your children is true or relevant,
11	and you have covered that already.
12	So let's move on then to question 6:
13	"If your position is that you did not receive a call
14	from Mr Lewis as reported in the FLO log, can you
15	explain his contemporaneous record of that
16	conversation?"
17	And I should because here to note that in the
18	question, it's referred to as a contemporaneous record.
19	That may not be correct that Mr Lewis's evidence is that
20	the entry was written up at 16.45 on 5th so nearly
21	24 hours later. But leaving that to one side, in your
22	response you say, "it is either false or it is the
23	following day when he calls and the family then have to
24	be told the PM has gone ahead".
25	What do you mean by "the following day", what are

1 you alluding to when you say he calls the following day? Well, on 5 May is when I contact Frank Mulholland, 5 May 2 Α. 3 that morning before the family arrive, I have the 4 conversation with Frank -- or, sorry, Lord Mulholland 5 and then I meet with the family and then when I'm in my office at Carlton Place with the family, I receive a 6 7 phone call from the PIRC. At that point when I'm saying about I had a conversation with the Lord Advocate, 8 9 postmortem is obviously been kept on hold, we're going 10 to get a pathologist instructed, that's the point where 11 he says, "oh, the postmortem has already taken place, it 12 took place yesterday" and I say to the family "the 13 postmortem has already taken place" and I remember the 14 screams in my room, the upset, the tears as in how could 15 this be possible. Sheku's mother wanted to see her son before a postmortem took place; his sisters wanted to 16 17 see their son(sic); Adi wanted to see his brother-in-law and they were like, "but why", because they were told --18 19 they had said -- they had said to the PIRC, "hold it, 20 wait for his mother to arrive", and they couldn't even 21 give that family at the courtesy of holding back a 22 postmortem. I have seen in my time as a criminal defence lawyer the number of times that postmortems 23 haven't taken place immediately, haven't taken place 24 immediately. And of course it's a Bank Holiday weekend. 25

If they had held it back to the 5th, what difference
would it have made to the PIRC? Not at all. But of
course the postmortem we now know police officers were
present that shouldn't have been present but the family
weren't entitled to be present.

Q. Let's look at question 7:

"If you accept that a conversation took place on 4 May at 17.48 in which there was a discussion about the postmortem, please also comment on the following extract from Mr Lewis's inquiry statement:

"'Aamer certainly did not express any surprise when I told him the postmortem had been completed, subject to toxicology and a brain tissue exam. He asked who was the pathologist. There was no surprise. I assumed that he was aware of that. There was certainly nothing to say that he was unaware of the postmortem going on'."

Now, your response to that is "not true" and if we scroll down we'll see that you, in support of your position that this is not true, advance a number of paragraphs, I think ten in total, if we could very quickly scroll through those, just to be sure. Ten paragraphs in total or ten points that you make in support of your statement that this is just not true. What I would like to do is go through these points with you in turn and ask some questions.

1 However, I'm mindful that it's a couple of minutes until one o'clock, sir? 2 COURT: Yes, I think we'll stop for lunch and we'll deal 3 with that after lunch at 2 o'clock. 4 5 (1.00 pm)(Luncheon adjournment) 6 7 (2.04 pm)LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson. 8 9 MS THOMSON: Thank you. We were about to look at your 10 answer to question 7 and your response to the Rule 8 request and this is where you make ten statements in 11 12 support of your position that Alistair Lewis's account 13 of the conversation you had on the 4th is untrue. So 14 let's look at these in turn. The first statement reads: 15 "I had already been told on 4 May by the family that they wished the postmortem to be put on hold and Ade had 16 17 told the PIRC that they wished it delayed until Mrs Bayoh had arrived and she had seen Sheku." 18 So you say here that you had already been told that 19 20 the family had asked for the postmortem to be delayed. 21 Who was it that told you that had happened, that the 22 family had made that request? A. I think it was Ade. Ade was the person initially that I 23 was having all the conversations with. 24 And when did he provide you with that information? 25 Q.

1 Α. That would have been during the day sometime on 4 May. 2 Let's look at your second point: Q. "In conversation with Alistair Lewis this was 3 4 reiterated by myself on 4 May. For him to claim that he 5 told me the postmortem had gone ahead makes no sense." Do you recall what it was that you said to Mr Lewis 6 7 when you say here that you had reiterated the position on 4 May? 8 I think it was just what I said, in terms of the 9 Α. 10 postmortem, just reiterating what the family had said 11 and I believe what the family had already said to the 12 PIRC that, can you just hold it back, the position would 13 normally be we would want to get our own independent 14 pathologists in and of course Aminata Bayoh, Sheku's 15 mother, wanted to see her son before the postmortem took place and there was no problem with that. 16 Do you recall how Mr Lewis responded when you said that? 17 Q. There was no opposition to that. He didn't turn around 18 Α. 19 to me and say, "I'm sorry, Aamer, the postmortem is 20 going to have to go ahead." There was none of that, it 21 was just like, that's fine, he knew that was the request 22 of the family. Q. Okay let's look at point 3: 23 "Had he told me I would not have sent a text at 24 25 9.48 am on 5 May to then Lord Advocate Frank Mulholland

1 KC in the following terms: "'Hi Frank, I'm acting for the family of Sheku Bayoh 2 3 who died on 3 May, Kirkaldy. I have spoken to PIRC. 4 Real concerns about investigation and what happened. 5 I'm conscious this could go tits up, but I'm meeting with the family later today and it would be good to 6 7 touch base with someone friendly at Crown Office dealing with it. I understand Dave Green may be in charge, but 8 9 probably can't stand the sight of me since the old days 10 of Chhokar, plus family want an independent postmortem or rather our pathologist to be present before it goes 11 12 ahead." 13 Now, this appears to be the text of a message that 14 you sent to Lord Mulholland at 9:48 hours on 5 May? 15 Α. Correct. Is that right? Where does that text come from? It's in 16 Q. quotation marks. Does that come from your telephone or 17 other records? 18 I retained all the telephones, mobiles, I had since 2015 19 Α. 20 and still retain them and have the text on that mobile 21 phone. 22 Okay. So you make the point here that if you had known Q. the postmortem had taken place, then you wouldn't have 23 had any reason to send the message in which you refer to 24 having the family's pathologist present before the 25

postmortem goes ahead.

1

2 Let's look at Point 4: 3 "A text message was sent to the PIRC to ask them to 4 phone me as I wanted to speak to them about my dialogue with the LA." 5 6 That's Lord Advocate, I think. 7 Α. Yes. "But also about having a second pathologist to be 8 Q. 9 present for the PM [that's the postmortem] for the family." 10 Do you recall when you sent that text message to the 11 12 PIRC? 13 A. It would have been sometime after I think Frank, sorry, 14 Lord Mulholland phoned me back or maybe it was just 15 before but if I have said it was after the dialogue, it would be after Lord Mulholland had contacted me and 16 17 spoken to me. 18 All right. Do you recall what you said in that message? Q. 19 I think it's just reiteration about the postmortem and Α. 20 pathologist because I think at that point I was trying 21 to get hold of Professor Busuttil to be the independent 22 pathologist on behalf of the family. Q. Okay. I wonder if we can perhaps look at the FLO log, 23 that's PIRC 04150, page 25. So here is an entry dated 24 9.47 on 5th: 25

1		Text message from Admer Anwar to Carr mim
2		urgently."
3		And I'm wondering whether that could perhaps refer
4		to the text message that you sent to the PIRC on 5th
5		after you spoke with the Lord Advocate.
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	And we see that this entry was written up, if we scroll
8		down a little bit, we'll see it was written up at
9		17.10 hours on 5th. Now, did the PIRC return your call?
10	Α.	I think the PIRC returned my call when the family
11		arrived in my office and after I had had a meeting
12		sorry, after the family had arrived in my office so I
13		had had the discussion with Lord Mulholland, the family
14		arrived in my office and whilst the family are there, I
15		received the phone call.
16	Q.	All right. Let's look at the entry that follows on from
17		this one because it appears to relate to another phone
18		call in between those two events. "So return call re
19		previous entry" and the previous entry was the PIRC
20		receiving your text message. This entry is dated 10.29
21		on 5th:
22		"Aamer Anwar asking why police officers involved in
23		the incident have not been suspended. Advised
24		responsibility of Police Scotland. Stated he will be
25		phoning Lord Advocate and Police Scotland to complain.

Thereafter ..." 1 2 And then there's a reference to the FLO having a 3 meeting with some people. And if we scroll down just a little bit further we 4 5 see that the entry was written up at 17.20 on the 5th. So this appears to be a record of the FLO returning your 6 7 call or phoning you in response to the text message that you had sent earlier that morning. It was written up 8 9 much later in the day at 17.20 and it records you asking 10 why the police hadn't been suspended and saying that you were going to phone the Lord Advocate in the 11 12 Police Scotland to complain. We don't see anything in 13 this particular entry about your dialogue with 14 Lord Mulholland and having a second pathologist at 15 the -- at the autopsy, that hasn't been recorded by the FLO, would you wish to offer any comment on that? 16 I don't have a recollection of it but of course my 17 Α. mantra every single day after 4 May was just keep 18 19 repeating to the PIRC and to the Crown Office and to the 20 Lord Advocate as to why those officers involved in the 21 restraint of Sheku Bayoh were not suspended and I also 22 note that this note, date and time is taken after the event, 17.20 on 5 May, when obviously there is uproar in 23 the office and I have spoken to Lord Mulholland who 24 apologises because he didn't know the postmortem had 25

1		taken place and obviously I would say as a
2		back-covering exercise. These notes are not taken at
3		the time. They're responded to after the event when
4		they know there's trouble that potentially lies ahead
5		because the family are asking why, why did you go ahead
6		with the postmortem, what was the haste, what was the
7		rush, why did you have to rush it so quickly, could you
8		not hold on for his mother.
9	Q.	Let's go back to your response to the Rule 8 request,
10		please, and look at point 5. So it was question 7,
11		I think, and point 5 beneath that. Let's, sorry, look
12		at Point 4 briefly, just to get our bearings and Point 4
13		you reference the text message to the PIRC, as you
14		wanted to speak to them about your dialogue with the
15		Lord Advocate and about having a second pathologist
16		present. And then at point 5 you say:
17		"This was followed that morning with a phone call
18		discussion with Lord Mulholland in which I verbally
19		requested if we could have our pathologist attend the
20		postmortem and to wait until Mrs Bayoh could attend.
21		Lord Mulholland confirmed that there was not a problem
22		with my request."
23		So I think that's perhaps self explanatory. Let's
24		look at point 6:
25		"It makes no sense at all, as is wrongly claimed,

that I had been told by the PIRC the evening before a PM 1 had taken place, why then would I be texting the LA in 2 3 the morning and following it up with a telephone discussion with the Lord Advocate." 4 5 And again I think that speaks for itself. 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. Let's look at point 7. "The family were in my office that afternoon when I 8 9 spoke to Alistair Lewis advising him of my discussion with the Lord Advocate. It was only at that stage that 10 I was told the PM had gone ahead. Some members of the 11 12 family became visibly upset and angry. Alistair Lewis 13 was unable to provide a satisfactory explanation as to 14 why they had not awaited the family. He never once said 15 that he had advised me of the PM the previous day." I want to ask some questions arising out of this 16 17 paragraph. Do you recall the time of the meeting with the family? 18 A. It would have been after around about 11 o'clock or just 19 20 after that I think, recollection. I can't be sure but 21 I think it was around about that time, it was in the 22 morning so. Was it a long meeting or a short meeting? 23 Q. It was a meeting that lasted I think probably up to 24 Α. between probably around about 40 minutes, 40 minutes or 25

2 Now, do you recall, did you phone Mr Lewis or did he Q. 3 call you? 4 Α. I think he called me. 5 And just to be clear, this was during the meeting when Q. 6 the family were present with you in your offices in 7 Glasgow? Yes, the sisters; Ade Johnson, the brother-in-law; 8 Α. 9 Aminata Bayoh, the mother; Collette Bell, Sheku's 10 partner; and then there was extended family members of 11 the Bayoh family. 12 Q. Was this a private call or did you have Mr Lewis on 13 private speaker? 14 I think -- no, I think this was a call to me but the Α. 15 family were sat in the room when the call came in because I said, "what do you mean, the postmortem has 16 17 gone ahead?" and at that point I remember there was --18 it felt like there were screams from the family who was 19 sat in my room. Upset, screams of anguish and tears. 20 And I think I had to say to the family, "Could you just 21 be quiet for a second, I need to see what's going on". 22 So it was a private call but the family were in the room Q. and they would have appreciated the postmortem had gone 23 ahead when you said to Mr Lewis words to the effect of 24 "what do you mean, the postmortem has gone ahead?" 25

1

so.

1	Α.	Yes, I couldn't understand why it had gone ahead, what
2		was the haste and why the family weren't told. They had
3		ample opportunity. They could have told them on 4 May
4		when the family liaison officers were meeting with the
5		family. They could have told me. They didn't tell me,
6		they didn't tell the family and that morning as well
7		they didn't tell me and then it's after the
8		Lord Advocate intervenes that all of a sudden it's like
9		oh, postmortem has gone ahead.
L 0	Q.	Let's look at the entry in the FLO log that relates to
L1		what I think is the same call. This is on page 30 of
12		the FLO log, please. Now, this call is timed at
13		14:20 hours. We'll look at the text of it in a moment
L 4		but it appears to relate to at the same conversation.
L5		Your recollection was that your meeting with the family
L 6		had been in the morning about 11. Nothing may turn on
L7		the timings but I'm wondering whether your recollection
L8		of the timing is potentially inaccurate?
L9	Α.	No, I recollect it being in the morning that I arranged
20		to meet with the family.
21	Q.	All right. Let's look at the entry.
22		"Phone call from Aamer Anwar. He has spoken with
23		Lord Advocate, who has stated postmortem will be put on
24		hold. Reminded of phone call and entry at page 14."
25		And that's the entry we've already looked at that's

from the call at 17:48 on 4th.

"Further reminder, the family refused to do formal identification and crown had directed PM would go ahead for 5.15. Stated he was with family and he was unaware of PM. Reminded of entry at page 14."

How did Mr Lewis react when you told him that you had spoken to the Lord Advocate and the Lord Advocate said that the PM would be put on hold?

- A. I think in all my dealings with the PIRC there was -- in the initial period there was almost like a shock that I could contact the Lord Advocate directly and a sense of nervousness from them because I was going above their heads, these were the messenger boys, not being disparaging but they were family liaison officers who weren't giving information to the family so I thought I need to go to the top and ask Lord Mulholland what's going on, what can you do to assist, so I think it was shock and nervousness when I told them that I had spoken to the Lord Advocate.
- Q. In the entry in the FLO log and, sorry, let's just scroll to the bottom to see when that entry was written up, written up at half past 5 on 5th but the entry again if we can go back to the content of it, please, Mr Lewis said that he reminded you twice of the previous conversation the one on the evening of 4th but your

1		evidence is that he did not say that he told you the
2		previous day that the postmortem had taken place. Now,
3		again we had your response to the Rule 8 request
4		available to us when Mr Lewis gave his evidence and on
5		the second day of giving evidence, that was day 87, it
6		was put to him, again if you'll bear with me, it's
7		another relatively long passage from the evidence but
8		I'll simply read out what he said and then invite your
9		comment.
10	Α.	Okay.
11	Q.	"Question: Phone call from Aamer, he has spoken with
12		Lord Advocate who has stated postmortem will be put on
13		hold. What did you think when he said that to you?
14		Answer: I was surprised at that information.
15		Question: "What was going through your mind?"
16		Answer: Well, just I would assume that the
17		Lord Advocate would know through Dave Green and
18		management within the Crown Office that the postmortem
19		had taken place.
20		Question: You say, reminded him of phone call and
21		entry at page 14. When you say you reminded him of that
22		phone call, what did you say to him?
23		Answer: Just reminding him of the phone call in
24		relation to the result of the postmortem.
25		Question: How did he react to that?

1		Answer: I can't remember how he reacted to it.
2		I think that is when he said the family was with him and
3		they were unaware.
4		Question: Can we go back to the entry we were
5		looking at a moment ago on page 30. He said he was with
6		the family and unaware of the PM and again you reminded
7		him of the conversation you say took place the night
8		before. Again how did you feel, what was going through
9		your mind when Aamer told you that he was with the
10		family and he was unaware that the postmortem had taken
11		place?
12		Answer: That's why I reminded him of it. I couldn't
13		understand that he was saying well, basically the
14		postmortem had gone ahead and I had given him the
15		information in relation to the result of the postmortem.
16		It's not being aware of it, I couldn't understand that.
17		Question: how did he react to you saying that?
18		Answer: I can't remember any particular reaction in
19		relation to that conversation other than stating he was
20		with the family and he was unaware of the postmortem so
21		again I reminded him of the entry and informing him of
22		the result of the postmortem."
23		Can I invite your comment on that chapter of
24		evidence?
25	Α.	It's absolute utter nonsense. I remember specifically

1		saying to Mr Lewis, what do you mean, the postmortem has
2		gone ahead? You were supposed to wait. And obviously
3		he had the discussion with Lord Mulholland. Never once
4		did he say to me but I told you about the postmortem
5		yesterday not once, not twice, because if he had done in
6		the presence of the family there would have been a
7		full-blown argument. It was bad enough that
8		conversation with the family sitting there crying and
9		upset for him to then say that he reminded me and then
10		he further reminded me and how convenient he's got at
11		page 14 and it's on his log. I find it surprising that
12		all his notes are from 5 May. Why are they not from
13		4 May? Why are they not earlier on in those times. Why
14		are they not all after the event when the Lord Advocate
15		has obviously picked up the phone to find out what is
16		going on.
17	Q.	I'm going to take you to another much shorter chapter of
18		Mr Lewis's evidence carrying on from where we left off.
19		"Question: The tone of this written entry is quite
20		calm. Was the conversation a calm conversation?
21		Answer: I don't remember it being anything other
22		than a calm conversation.
23		Question: Could you hear anything going on in the
24		background?
25		Answer: No, I don't remember anything going on in

Τ		the background."
2		Could you invite your comment on that?
3	Α.	Again absolutely utter nonsense. It's surprising that
4		Mr Lewis can hear my children but he can't hear a family
5		screaming when they found out that their son or
6		brother's postmortem has taken place despite thinking
7		that it wasn't going to go ahead.
8	Q.	Returning to his evidence, picking up where we left off
9		"Question: Aamer Anwar says you were unable to provide a
L 0		satisfactory explanation as to why they hadn't waited
L1		for the family. Do you recall being asked about that?
L2		Answer: I don't recall being asked that specifically
L3		other than what is in my FLO log as to the Crown had
L 4		instructed that the postmortem was going ahead and that,
L5		you know, I told him the result of the postmortem."
L 6		Again can I invite your comment?
L7	Α.	Again it's not the truth, it's absolute nonsense. The
L8		family was sat there, they heard the conversation,
L 9		I remember the conversation. It was: Why has it gone
20		ahead? And never once did he say to me, "Oh, we had a
21		phone call yesterday and I told you about it". Why
22		would he tell me? I hadn't even met the family at that
23		point in time. He was meeting the family. Why didn't
24		he tell the family at the time, "by the way at this time
25		on 4 May there's a postmortem going ahead" but he's

1		saying he phoned he to tell me to tell the family. It
2		doesn't make any sense because I hadn't met the family
3		and yet they're meeting with the family and they don't
4		bother to tell them there's a postmortem taking place.
5	Q.	Returning to Mr Lewis' oral evidence:
6		"Question: Mr Anwar also says that you never once
7		said that you had advised him of the PM the previous day
8		so he denies you referring back to the entry that we've
9		looked at at page 14 of your log. Can I invite you to
10		comment on that?"
11		And he said:
12		"That's Mr Anwar's opinion but I have got it logged
13		there that I did tell him the result of the postmortem
14		and the crown instruction was that the postmortem was
15		going ahead.
16		"Question: But did you appreciate that irrespective
17		of how it had come about there had been a fundamental
18		breakdown in communication here?
19		Answer: There would appear to have been, yes."
20		Again can I invite your comment on that passage?
21	A.	Again it's not true. The notes were taken on 5 May in
22		the evening, they're not from the time, and this was
23		just one of the many breakdowns in communication by PIRC
24		with the family, they just didn't listen.
25	Q.	Can we return to your Rule 8 response, please, and look

1 at point 8: "This was then followed by a phone call to the 2 Lord Advocate to apologise that it had gone ahead and 3 said he was unaware. This was just one of many issues 4 with PIRC that shattered trust in the PIRC and in 5 ability to keep the family informed." 6 7 Again I wonder if we might go back to the FLO log and look at another entry that may have a bearing on 8 9 this. Sorry, I have not noted the page but it will 10 follow from the entry that we looked at previously, which I think was page 30. There we are. So this is an 11 12 entry relating to a contact with yourself at 15:15 hours on the 5th and the FLO has recorded: 13 14 "Family now wish to view the body. Is it viewable? 15 Will be instructing their own pathologist. States the Lord Advocate is astonished PM went ahead. Aamer states 16 17 mother of Sheku had told Police Scotland she wished to view the body before the PM. At that time, she was 18 travelling up from England." 19 20 So there's a record here of you saying that the Lord 21 Advocate was astonished that the postmortem had gone 22 ahead and the entry suggests that you spoke with Lord Mulholland and then spoke again with Mr Lewis; 23 would that be correct? 24 25 A. Correct.

1 Q. Returning, if we may, to your Rule 8 response, at point 2 9, you say: 3 "Furthermore, the above is supported by notes typed up from the first few days following Sheku Bayoh's death 4 5 that states the following: "'AA asked for the postmortem to be put on hold so 6 7 that our independent pathologist could examine the body. Professor Busuttil, difficult for second examination. 8 9 Needed the family consent. Arranged meeting with Alistair." 10 Where was this recorded, this information that 11 12 appears in quotation marks? 13 I think we had multiple counsel notebooks and in that Α. 14 there was notes that were given to the secretary at the 15 time to type up any meetings. My writing is illegible so half the time my secretary or trainees would have 16 17 great difficulty trying to understand what was written 18 so ... 19 And have you recorded in the notebook the date and time Q. 20 of that particular entry? I think it was taken from -- I mean, I can't be sure, 21 Α. 22 can't be sure. And do you still have those notebooks? 23 Q. Somewhere in storage because we moved offices from 24 Α. 25 Carlton Place to Blytheswood Square and you have to

1 appreciate that in nine years there was a huge quantity of notebooks and of course on 3 May 2015 we didn't know 2 3 there would be a public inquiry and we didn't know there 4 would be a lack of justice but I tried to keep as much 5 as possible as the time went on together so that if it came to something like this that one day we would be 6 7 able to provide the Inquiry or whatever form of inquiry it was with the evidence, including my text messages. 8

- Q. And you said you have retained all of those?
- 10 A. Yes.

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11 Q. And let's look at point 10:

"A subsequent meeting with Alistair Lewis took place at the office on 6 May at which full details of the initial PM were provided and I was told the cause of death was unascertained. I asked who instructed the PM and was told the crown samples had been retained."

And again I wonder if we can cross refer what you say here with the FLO log, if we could bring that up, please, and look at page 39. So here we have an entry dated 6 May, 12:15, and if we scroll down we'll see that the FLO attended at your office, various family members were present as were representatives of PIRC, and if we scroll down to look at the bottom five or six lines:

"Also told of result of PM in presence of the family by DSI Little. Unascertained, subject to toxicology and

1	brain tissue exam."
2	So that would appear to be a record of the
3	conversation that you have referred to at paragraph 10
4	in your statement.
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Okay. Can you bear with me just a moment, please?
7	Thank you, Mr Anwar, I have no further questions.
8	A. Thank you.
9	LORD BRACADALE: Are there any rule 9 applications?
10	Well, Mr Anwar, thank you very much for coming to
11	give evidence to the Inquiry and for providing the
12	lengthy statement that you already have provided and I
13	also want to recognise the enormous amount of work that
14	you have put into this case over the years. The Inquiry
15	will now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.
16	(2.31 pm)
17	(The hearing was adjourned to 10.00 am on Wednesday, 2
18	October 2024)
19	INDEX
20	1AAMER ANWAR (sworn)
21	Examination-in-chief by MS THOMSON1
22	
23	
24	