Τ	Tuesday, 27 June 2023
2	(10.00 am)
3	LORD BRACADALE: Good morning and welcome to this hearing in
4	the Sheku Bayoh inquiry.
5	One of my Assessors, Mr Raju Bhatt, will be
6	attending the hearing remotely.
7	The purpose of this hearing is to give the legal
8	representatives of core participants the opportunity, if
9	they wish, to make oral submissions. A number of core
10	participants have already lodged written submissions and
11	after I have heard all the oral submissions, the written
12	submissions will be published on the Inquiry's website.
13	The oral submissions will allow representatives to
14	highlight or develop points made in the written
15	submissions. Legal representatives will have up to
16	40 minutes to make their oral submissions.
17	As I indicated at the end of the last hearing, the
18	submissions at this stage are focused on the evidence
19	about the events leading up to and including the death
20	of Sheku Bayoh and the cause of death. There is of
21	course still a substantial amount of evidence to be led
22	in the Inquiry. It would therefore be premature for me
23	to draw any conclusions at this stage and I will not be
24	issuing an interim report.
25	When all the evidence is completed, core

1	participants will have an opportunity to make final
2	submissions on the whole evidence. The current
3	submissions will allow me to assess the evidence led in
4	relation to the events and the cause of death and
5	consider whether there are any areas which require
6	further exploration.
7	The oral submissions will be taken in the following
8	order: first, Senior Counsel to the Inquiry, thereafter
9	counsel for the Bayoh families; counsel for
10	Police Scotland; counsel for Ms Short, PC Walker and the
11	Scottish Police Federation; counsel for Mr Paton,
12	counsel for Constables Good, Smith and Tomlinson;
13	counsel for Sergeant Maxwell and Constables Gibson and
14	McDonough; and finally counsel for the Coalition for
15	Racial Equality and Rights.
16	Counsel for the remaining core participants have
17	indicated that they do not intend to make oral
18	submissions.
19	I intend to take breaks at appropriate points in the
20	course of the hearing, so can we begin with Counsel to
21	the Inquiry, Ms Grahame.
22	Submissions by MS GRAHAME
23	MS GRAHAME: Thank you.
24	Shortly after 04.00 hours on Sunday 3 May 2015,
25	Sheku Bayoh was spending time with friends at the home

1 of Martyn Dick. During their time at Mr Dick's property, Mr Bayoh began to act differently and believed 2 3 the others in the house were being disrespectful towards 4 him. At around 05.30 hours he left the house abruptly. 5 This was out of character. Zahid Saeed tried to find 6 7 him and they met up outside Mr Bayoh's home at Arran Crescent in Kirkcaldy. Mr Bayoh did not recognise 8 9 him and thought he was in the CID. His eyes were 10 switching and his personality changing. Mr Saeed attempted to leave and was followed by Mr Bayoh, who 11 12 punched Mr Saeed to the head several times and chased 13 him with a wooden washing line pole. 14 After Mr Saeed fell, Mr Bayoh punched him several 15 times to the head, face and body. Subsequent toxicological analysis confirmed MDMA and 16 17 Alpha PVP in his blood and urine. The medical evidence suggests he was suffering from psychostimulant 18 intoxication and drug-induced psychosis. 19 20 It is likely that Mr Bayoh returned to his house and 21 took a knife from a set in his kitchen. He then encountered his neighbour, Mr Neil Morgan, in the street 22 and Mr Morgan spoke to Mr Bayoh and noticed he was 23 holding a knife. He invited Mr Bayoh to come back, 24 "Have a cup of coffee, a cup of tea, you need to settle 25

1 down". Mr Bayoh replied that he was fine. Mr Bayoh seemed calm, although Mr Morgan described his eyes as 2 3 "starey" and said Mr Bayoh wasn't himself. 4 Afterwards, Mr Bayoh walked a journey of under 5 1 mile to Hayfield Road. Within a period of 8 minutes between 07.09.43 and 07.16.33, six emergency calls were 6 7 received in the Police Scotland area control room at Bilston Glen. This included calls from Mrs Joyce at 8 9 07.11 who described a black man who had a 9-inch knife 10 in his hand, and Mr Kolberg who described the man jumping out, trying to hit other cars, stopping 11 12 vehicles, he said he didn't know what was wrong with 13 him. 14 These calls were received by the area control room 15 and classified as grade 1. That's defined as: "An ongoing incident where there is an immediate or 16 17 apparent threat to life or a serious crime in progress." The ACR deployed officers to respond to the incident 18 and continued to monitor calls and update their STORM 19 20 log. They continued to communicate with and listen to 21 Airwaves messages with the responding officers. At 07.16.32, PC Tomlinson and PC Short were diverted 22 to deal with the incident. All units were summoned and 23 PC Paton and PC Walker rerouted and arrived at 24 Hayfield Road at 07.20.23. They were the first to 25

1 arrive. At the time Mr Bayoh was walking along Hayfield Road near the bus stop. He was described as 2 3 "goggle-eyed, oblivious to everything else that's going 4 on about him". Both officers got out of the van armed with CS and 5 PAVA spray. Both shouted commands at Mr Bayoh, to which 6 7 he did not respond, and both officers discharged their sprays. The sprays had no effect on Mr Bayoh. 8 9 At 07.20.39, reinforcements arrived in the form of PC Tomlinson and PC Short, approximately 16 seconds 10 behind PC Walker and PC Paton. 11 12 Mr Bayoh walked up the nearby footpath away from PC Paton and PC Walker, who were affected by the 13 14 discharge of their sprays, and PC Tomlinson and PC Short 15 began mirroring him. PC Tomlinson was shouting commands at the top of his 16 17 voice. There was no reaction. PC Tomlinson took out 18 his spray and adopted a defensive stance and sprayed his CS spray twice. On the second occasion he navigated the 19 20 wind direction. This had no effect on Mr Bayoh. 21 At some point PC Short stopped and took out her 22 baton. Mr Bayoh looked at her and started walking towards her with a kind of boxer skip. She swiped her 23 baton towards him but did not make contact and then ran 24

away. As she ran across Hayfield Road she felt him

25

1 behind her and then she was hit with what she described as "an almighty blow" to the back of her head in the 2 area of her ear. She was unable to stay on her feet and 3 fell forward, putting her hands out to save herself. 4 5 The next thing she remembered she was curling up into a ball and grabbing the bun at the back of her 6 7 head, trying to protect her head. She did not recall being stamped. 8 At this point versions diverge and I address this in 9 10 some detail in my written submissions. PC Tomlinson stated Mr Bayoh stomped on her back 11 12 with his foot with a great deal of force. He put his 13 full body weight into the stomp and used his arms to 14 gain leverage, then stomped on her back again with the 15 same force and she was not moving. He is supported to some extent by PC Walker, who 16 gave evidence that he also saw Mr Bayoh stamp once on 17 18 PC Short. 19 In response, PC Tomlinson struck him with his baton about two or three times in total to the head area. He 20 21 also struck him two or three times with his baton to 22 Mr Bayoh's arms. On the contrary, Mr Nelson, who lived in 23 Hayfield Road at the time, has given evidence that the 24 stamp and stamps did not take place. There are images 25

available to you, Chair, created by Mr DeGiovanni of

Advanced Laser Imaging of the scene from the living room

of Mr Nelson which may assist you in assessing his

viewpoint.

In addition there is medical evidence, including photographs, regarding the injuries to PC Short and their location and there is forensic evidence about a mark on PC Short's vest from a number of experts, including Professor Dawson who gave evidence about contact between Mr Bayoh's footwear and the samples from PC Short's vest.

I address all these matters in the detailed evidence, which may either support or contradict the evidence of PC Tomlinson, PC Walker and Mr Nelson, in my written submissions.

At that point Mr Bayoh was brought to the ground by PC Walker, who shoulder-charged or bear-hugged him to the ground. PC Short attempted to stand up but her legs weren't working. She tried to get up again and she saw PC Paton, who came over and helped her up and he told her to run to the van.

The restraint was fast moving but again I have addressed the detailed evidence available to you in my submissions. In short, the officers sought to gain control and pin down Mr Bayoh and he resisted their

1 attempts. They sought to apply handcuffs and leg restraints. Mr Bayoh struggled, using what was 2 3 described as extreme force. PC Walker punched him a couple of times to his face and PC Tomlinson delivered 4 5 two or three baton blows to Mr Bayoh's Achilles area and then straddled his legs. 6 7 At 07.21.19, PC Tomlinson pushed the emergency button for assistance. By the time he did so, Mr Bayoh 8 9 was on the ground for maybe seconds and PC Tomlinson 10 continued to sit straddling his legs. Mr Bayoh flicked his legs and caused PC Tomlinson to lose his balance and 11 12 his grip on his handcuffs and PC Tomlinson changed his 13 position in response to this action to lie across 14 Mr Bayoh's legs diagonally to stop this movement. 15 The first officers arrived at 07.20.23 and by the time PC Tomlinson pressed his emergency button it was 16 17 07.21.19. On my calculation this is a period of around 56 seconds. By this time Mr Bayoh was on the ground 18 with PC Tomlinson straddling his legs. CS and PAVA 19 20 sprays had been discharged in his direction by three 21 officers. He had been struck with a baton multiple times to the head and arms and he had been 22 shoulder-charged to the ground. 23 PC Paton was the third officer to assist with the 24

restraint. PC Paton was located closer to Mr Bayoh's

25

1 head. PC Paton had a baton and passed it through Mr Bayoh's left arm to try and apply the handcuffs. 2 PC Tomlinson attempted to apply a handcuff to Mr Bayoh's 3 4 right wrist but as he did so, Mr Bayoh pulled his hand 5 forward, dragging PC Tomlinson closer to him. Mr Bayoh 6 then attempted a press-up off the ground, lifting the 7 officers. At 07.21.28 to 31 seconds, PC Smith and PC Good 8 arrived. After attending to PC Short, PC Smith went 9 10 over to assist with the restraint. PC Smith warned Mr Bayoh that he would spray him with CS spray if he did 11 12 not stop resisting but was told by PC Walker that it 13 would be ineffective. 14 As incapacitant spray was not an option, PC Smith 15 assisted the other officers to gain control of Mr Bayoh's hands and allow handcuffs to be applied. 16 Handcuffs and leg restraints were applied and the 17 18 officers gained control. 19 Once the Fast Straps had been applied, PC Smith stood up, moving away slightly. When he stood up 20 21 PC Smith checked the injuries to his hands and turned 22 his attention elsewhere for around 30 seconds to a minute. PC Tomlinson got off Mr Bayoh's legs and 23 Mr Bayoh was rolled on to his left side. PC Tomlinson 24 then searched Mr Bayoh's pockets on his right side 25

looking for a knife. There was no knife found on 1 Mr Bayoh. Officers later found a knife in a grassy area 2 along Hayfield Road. 3 Officers noticed, when Mr Bayoh was turned on to his 4 5 left-hand side, that he had stopped struggling. His eyes were shut and he was moving when he was turned on 6 7 to his left-hand side -- sorry, his eyes were shut and he was not moving when he was turned on to his left-hand 8 side. He was unconscious, he was unresponsive. 9 10 Officers did not know whether anyone was monitoring Mr Bayoh's breathing prior to them realising that he was 11 12 unconscious. 13 At 07.25.17, PC Smith transmitted over the Airwaves: 14 "This male now certainly appears to be unconscious, 15 breathing, not responsive, get an ambulance for him." This was the first call for an ambulance for 16 Mr Bayoh. 17 18 No additional information was given at that time 19 indicating that he had been sprayed with CS or PAVA, or 20 batoned to the head. 21 Dr Carey considered that the cause of Mr Bayoh's 22 loss of consciousness was hypoxia as a result of the restraint and struggle. He explained that loss of 23 consciousness represented a perilous situation, 24 particularly when a person is hypoxic, unless corrected 25

1	for example by rescue breaths, and would lead to cardiac
2	arrest.
3	At 07.29.30, Acting Police Sergeant Maxwell
4	transmitted via the Airwaves:
5	"This accused is now not breathing. CPR is
6	commencing."
7	PC Walker was performing chest compressions. CPR
8	appears to have commenced more than around 4 minutes
9	after Mr Bayoh was noted to be unconscious.
LO	PC Smith attempted to provide rescue breaths on
L1	three occasions with the face shield but was aware that
12	the breaths were escaping out of the side of Mr Bayoh's
13	mouth.
L 4	At 7.32.11, Acting Police Sergeant Maxwell
L5	transmitted:
16	"Chest compressions commenced, however breaths have
L7	stopped due to cross-contamination."
L8	PCs Smith and Paton attempted to fit a one-way valve
L 9	shield into Mr Bayoh's mouth but were unable to do so.
20	They attempted to open Mr Bayoh's mouth with their
21	fingers but were unsuccessful. Dr Shearer described
22	finding injuries to this area at the subsequent
23	post mortem which were consistent with those attempts.
24	At 07.33.35 the ambulance arrived at the locus and
25	ambulance staff attended to Mr Bayoh. They were unable

1 to find a pulse and transported him to Victoria Hospital. A police officer drove the ambulance 2 3 to the hospital so that both could continue working on 4 Mr Bayoh. 5 At around 07.45 in the morning the ambulance arrived at Victoria Hospital where Mr Bayoh was brought into 6 7 a resuscitation cubicle and medical intervention was undertaken by seven doctors, assisted by nursing staff. 8 9 When Mr Bayoh arrived at the hospital his wrists remained handcuffed with leg restraints still applied 10 and they were removed at a doctor's request. 11 12 On arrival a doctor checked Mr Bayoh's carotid 13 artery and found a pulse. She deduced that Mr Bayoh was 14 actually in respiratory arrest. She then lost 15 Mr Bayoh's pulse and concluded that he had gone into cardiac arrest and CPR commenced. CPR, both manual and 16 with the use of a Thumper machine, lasted for one hour 17 and 14 minutes. Life was pronounced extinct at 09.04 on 18 19 3 May 2015. 20 In assessing the circumstances that day you may wish 21 to begin by considering the way the incident was managed 22 by the ACR, the divisional officers, and the officers on the ground. Four options emerged in evidence. Firstly, 23 the RVP from the evidence of PC Paton; secondly, 24 observe, wait and feed back, which came from 25

1 Inspector Stewart; de-escalation, again which was spoken to by Inspector Stewart; and finally verbal dominance, 2 3 the hard stop, from Martin Graves. You will also need to consider whether the use of 4 5 force by each individual officer was justified and lawful, bearing in mind all the circumstances. You will 6 7 need to ask yourself whether it was necessary, proportionate and reasonable and whether the preclusion 8 9 principle was observed and that minimum force was used. You will wish to consider submissions on fact and 10 law and have particular regard to the use of force 11 12 standard operating procedure which was in force 13 in May 2015 and the officer safety training manual, 14 2013, which was also in force at that time. 15 You may be assisted in particular by paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 of the standard operating procedure, which lists 16 17 the profiled offender behaviour, categorised levels 1 to 18 6, and the reasonable officer response, categorised 19 levels 1 to 5. 20 These were mirrored in the manual which was in force 21 at the time and you have heard evidence from both PC Walker and PC Tomlinson about their understanding of 22 these categories. That evidence alone should be 23 sufficient to allow you to carry out that exercise if 24 you wish, but you may go on to consider the expert 25

1 evidence you have heard from Martin Graves and Joanne Caffrey. Both have given evidence. 2 3 Both are in agreement that the four tactical options 4 were open to reasonable officers that day, that these 5 options could be instructed by the ACR inspector, the sergeant on the ground, or the officers themselves. 6 7 They agree that all options were available to reasonable officers on that day. 8 9 Both Mr Graves and Ms Caffrey explained the framework that existed in the use of force SOP at the 10 time and gave examples and that should provide 11 12 additional assistance to you and allow you to compare 13 the actions of the officers who engaged with Mr Bayoh 14 against that framework. 15 In relation to the most recent hearing on cause of death there appears to be consensus amongst the medical 16 17 witnesses that Mr Bayoh's sudden death was due to sudden cardiac arrest contributed to by the drugs he consumed 18 and the restraint and struggle at Hayfield Road. 19 20 Dr Carey considered that although the death was 21 multi-factorial, the most significant factor was the 22 restraint and struggle. He proposed an adjustment to the wording of the cause of death certified by 23 Dr Shearer and Dr Bouhaidar, such that it would read: 24 "1(a) Sudden death in a man intoxicated by MDMA 25

1 (Ecstasy) and Alpha PVP in association with struggling 2 and restraint." 3 Dr Shearer and other doctors, including Dr Crane, agreed with this proposed form of words. 4 There were factors mentioned in evidence that all 5 medics were agreed had absolutely no bearing on 6 7 Mr Bayoh's cause of death. These included minor ailments, blunt force injuries, infection, excited 8 9 delirium and heart disease. Factors which may have had a bearing and upon which you have heard detailed medical 10 evidence include the consumption of illicit drugs, 11 12 restraint and struggle against restraint. I have 13 addressed these matters in detail in my written 14 submissions. 15 In addition to the above, you have also heard evidence about sickle cell trait. Mr Bayoh was 16 17 a carrier of the sickle cell trait and Dr Carey explained that the presence of sickling in someone with 18 that trait means they have been pushed to the limit 19 20 physiologically and become hypoxic, which has 21 precipitated sickling. He considered that the presence of sickling provided evidence of hypoxia and lactic 22 acidosis due to restraint and that sickling is an 23 independent marker for hypoxia. 24 25 Professor Lucas was of the view that the struggle

1 and restraint would have caused hypoxia and acidosis. The effect of the sickling in the lungs was respiratory 2 arrest leading to cardiac arrest. 3 4 Dr Carey agreed with Professor Lucas that sickling 5 developed during the restraint and struggle. In relation to sickling, Professor Lucas gave evidence that 6 7 sickle cell trait should be recorded under part 2 of the death certificate and Dr Shearer agreed. 8 9 You have also heard of petechial haemorrhages. 10 Dr Shearer's evidence was that petechial haemorrhages could indicate a degree of asphyxia, either positional, 11 12 being chest down; or mechanical, caused by the 13 application of pressure to the back which could impede 14 breathing. 15 Dr Carey agreed that petechial haemorrhages could be indicative of a degree of asphyxia, specifically 16 17 mechanical asphyxia due to the application of pressure, weight or force to the front or the back of the trunk. 18 He was of the view that substantial force was required 19 20 to cause petechial haemorrhages and the presence of the 21 petechial haemorrhages provided support for mechanical 22 asphyxia. My detailed written submissions address each of the 23 issues for consideration, particularly where that 24 evidence diverts. You alone will have the 25

1 responsibility of deciding which witnesses are telling 2 the truth and which witnesses are accurate in their 3 recollections. I have also addressed the guidance which 4 was provided to you on the questions of whether the 5 management of the event and the use of force by the officers was reasonable or excessive. 6 7 I have addressed issues regarding the legal test you may apply in determining cause of death. 8 9 You will now hear oral submissions from the core 10 participants on the events that occurred at Hayfield Road and the cause of death, which follow on 11 12 from their detailed written submissions which have been 13 provided to you, and you will receive considerable 14 assistance from them in this regard. 15 There are two final matters I would wish to raise at this stage. As you have noted this morning, these are 16 17 interim submissions. Further evidence will be led before you in relation to matters of some significance. 18 As a result, I would recommend that you do not form any 19 20 final concluded views about the actions and states of 21 mind of the officers pending that further evidence. 22 Firstly, I hope to lead further evidence about training at our hearing later this year and this may 23 impact on how you view the actions at Hayfield Road. 24 For example, PC Paton felt he did not have adequate 25

1	training for this situation.
2	Secondly, I hope to lead evidence about the
3	potential impact of racial threat theory in the final
4	race hearing next year. This may assist you in gaining
5	a fuller understanding of the events that occurred at
6	Hayfield Road.
7	Thank you very much.
8	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms Grahame.
9	Next on behalf of the families of Sheku Bayoh,
10	Ms Mitchell.
11	Submissions by MS MITCHELL
12	MS MITCHELL: We make our submissions in the form of
13	propositions and we will read with interest and care the
14	propositions of other core participants and where
15	appropriate make responses, either agreeing with or
16	highlighting areas of disagreement.
17	We do so in an effort to assist the Chair in
18	narrowing the relevant issues for him to consider, with
19	the assistance of the Assessors.
20	As just touched upon by my learned friend, we have
21	not finalised our position in relation to matters as it
22	is vital to hear all of the evidence before we make
23	suggestions in relation to findings.
24	Before detailing our submissions in writing, we have
25	produced for this morning an overarching introduction.

When, in October 2019, the Lord Advocate advised the Bayoh family that no police officer or Police Scotland would face charges for the death of Sheku Bayoh, his family felt betrayed, believing there had been a failure to hold power to account, that a flawed investigation had taken place where many promises made by those at Crown and PIRC were repeatedly broken over the course of a number of years.

From the very day that Sheku died, his family stated that the Sheku they knew and loved had acted out of character and if he broke the law then the police had a right to act. But the family fundamentally believed that any force used had to be reasonable, legitimate and proportionate. Under no circumstances did he deserve to die.

Within minutes of Sheku's death the family believed that misinformation began to be spread, not only information given to them directly but also appearing in the media. Police sources painted an image of a large black man with stereotypical characteristics of extraordinary strength and dangerousness, wielding a machete, to criminalise and to negate Sheku's right to life.

Matters in relation to media and race will of course be dealt with in later chapters, however some of those

issues arose in the session and the evidence of 1 police officers and the descriptions of Sheku Bayoh in 2 3 the written material. In relation to the incident itself, Sheku was 4 5 experiencing a mental health crisis and should have been dealt with as a medical emergency. According to the 6 7 Inquiry's reconstruction timeline, the first police van to arrive at Sheku Bayoh stops at 07.20.23 hours. 8 9 The police then shout at Sheku. 10 (Video played) By 07.20.29 two people were visible and moving near 11 12 the rear passenger side of the police van. This may 13 indicate that Sheku Bayoh had been sprayed within six seconds of the car first arriving and the officers 14 15 getting out. There was no standing back and assessing the situation, there was no reporting back to the 16 17 control room, there was no consideration given to the fact that this was a man whose actions were consistent 18 19 with being in a mental health crisis, an observation 20 which was made by people in their cars, by his neighbour 21 and indeed by the police themselves. A person is seen falling over and then: 22 23 "... there is some coming together and another 24 falls." Indicating that Sheku Bayoh was sprayed three times, 25

hit with a baton and forced to the ground within 40 to 50 seconds of the first police car arriving. Sheku was brought to the ground in less than 45 seconds of the first police contact, never to get up again.

Sheku was not 6-foot plus, he was 5-foot 10 inches and he weighed 12 stone, 10lb. The first two officers who dealt with him were, however, 17 and 25 stones and both 6-foot 4 inches tall.

We provide written submissions in some significant detail about restraint and about the cause of death, but in relation to the latter matter, as my learned friend has already indicated, there is a consensus on the cause of death.

Mr Bayoh suffered multiple injuries and was pronounced dead in hospital an hour and a half after first contact with the police. In contrast, none of the police suffered physical harm requiring significant medical attention that day.

The families, with the benefit of evidence heard during the Inquiry, understand that Sheku was in the throes of a medical health crisis. The process and procedures put in place to allow for assessment of a person in a mental health crisis were ignored. His safety was not considered. He ought to have been met with careful consideration and assessment. Instead

1 Sheku was met with immediate, verbal then physical 2 violence. 3 The reasoning for these actions given by PC Alan Paton was in the following terms: 4 5 "I was straight out of the passenger side door of the van and I immediately took out my CS spray out of my 6 7 vest. I continued to think that he may still have been in possession of a knife and I wasn't taking any risks. 8 9 As I have already said, I was still conscious of the 10 fact that just because I could see his palms, he might still have the knife in his waistband or secreted 11 12 somewhere about his person. With my spray in my 13 right-hand and pointing in the direction of the man 14 I shouted loudly and very clearly, 'Get down on the 15 ground'. The guy was walking towards me and completely ignored me. He kept walking with his palms out and 16 17 I remember thinking how crazy he looked, as if he was on a mission. I was in genuine fear for my life at this 18 point. I pressed my red emergency button and shouted 19 20 loudly and clearly, 'Get down on the fucking ground'. 21 My shouting and my pointing of my spray had absolutely 22 no bearing on him and he kept walking towards me, ignoring me as if he was in a one-track mind. I was 23 terrified and I thought I was going to get attacked by 24 him." 25

1	The question is asked:
2	"Question: Now, I would like to ask you some
3	questions about that paragraph. You have told us today
4	about your spray and shouting of commands. Now, earlier
5	today you talked about communication and I'm interested
6	you also say in your Inquiry statement you had been
7	trained in de-escalation procedures and I'm quite
8	interested in finding out there's no mention there of
9	communication in the sense of a conversation or
10	"Answer: It wasn't the time for a conversation.
11	"Question: Right, so you felt there wasn't time for
12	that?
13	"Answer: It wasn't the time or the situation for
14	a conversation.
15	"Question: Oh, sorry it wasn't the time? Right.
16	"Answer: Yes.
17	"Question: Is that because of the circumstances you
18	have told us about earlier?
19	"Answer: Yes.
20	"Question: So do you think that there was time to
21	ask him any questions like 'are you okay?' or anything
22	like that?
23	"Answer: It's not the situation for asking questions
24	like that. The man was out of control. The man was
25	drugged up. The man had a big knife. He was using it.

He was attacking cars. I needed firm control from the word go and then once he is in cuffs, then asking him if he is wanting a cup of tea or that, but not at that stage."

The incident has been described as a violent confrontation. It was the officers who initially offered violence to Sheku Bayoh. On arrival at the scene he walked with his hands outstretched in front of him, a non-violent, non-threatening gesture. He did not say anything which might suggest he would offer violence. He did not have a knife in his possession. He did not pose a risk level necessary to engage with him in the way that he did.

Instead of acting in accordance with their instructions or their own standard operating procedures and following the UK wide recognised force continuum model, through their own actions they escalated events beyond that which was necessary. They failed to follow the very reasonable option of containment suggested by Professor Eddleston.

We heard from experts on how people in a mental health crisis should be dealt with: to stay calm and to give the person space so as not to put them under pressure, to express empathy. As set out by Professor Eddleston in his report at paragraph 22:

"If the first police officers on the scene had realised that Mr Bayoh was psychotic, consistent with their observations that he was ignoring them and looking crazy, and had followed Police Scotland advice for dealing with psychotic patients, the outcome might have been different. Ideally open and empathetic questioning while offering Sheku Bayoh a space to keep walking might have calmed the situation and prevented the attack or the need to restrain him physically until submission.

In the meantime an ambulance could have been called to help take Sheku Bayoh to hospital.

"If this conservative approach had been ineffective, a combined physical and chemical restraint approach would have been necessary. At the very least, an ambulance and paramedic should have been present when physical restraint was initiated. This would have allowed paramedics to rapidly gain intravenous access to administer sedative diazepam and/or haloperidol under guidance if necessary from the local emergency department. At best restraint could have been delayed until a doctor had come urgently from the emergency department to help control the situation, allowing the administration of fast-acting ketamine."

We know that if Sheku Bayoh was treated in a calm and considered manner the outcome could have been

1 completely different. Only a short time before the police arrived at Hayfield Road, Sheku Bayoh had 2 3 a conversation with his neighbour, Mr Neil Morgan, who treated him with consideration, care and kindness. And 4 5 although it was clear to Neil Morgan that Sheku "was not himself", he was able to speak to him, to reason with 6 7 him, to get him to respond and invited him into his house for a coffee. He offered what Sheku needed: help. 8 9 It has been suggested that Mr Bayoh repeatedly 10 stamped on a female police officer. For the families, no credible or reliable evidence has been presented to 11 12 prove this. Rather the absence of significant forensic 13 evidence and the absence of medical evidence supports 14 the proposition that this stamp or stamps did not happen 15 and Officers Tomlinson and Walker ought not to be believed. 16 17 The evidence of an independent witness who saw what 18 happened from his window and did not see the stamp as described by these officers ought to be preferred. 19 20 Mr Bayoh was batoned to the head and brought to the 21 ground. As soon as reasonably practical thereafter communications should have been made to the control room 22 to get an ambulance to the scene. This was not done 23

Thereafter the police carried out a method of

until it was too late to save him.

24

25

restraint that they have been trained to understand is dangerous and carries with it a foreseeable risk to life. It is well recognised that the method of restraint used can produce life threatening positional asphyxia.

Whilst he was on the ground, Sheku was restrained and forced face down where he was handcuffed and leg restraints were applied to both his knees and ankles. Six officers were involved in restraining Sheku and during the time he was face down, six officers lay on top of Sheku, crossing over him from both sides and covering his whole body.

The first two officers, Paton and Walker, as already described, had a combined weight of 42 stones. The combined weight of six officers involved in the initial restraint was 446.7 kilograms, which is 86 stones and 21b, which is over half a tonne of body weight on Sheku.

One officer used a baton to hold Sheku down by pushing it on his body and other officers were also seen to be using their body weight in order to restrain Sheku by placing themselves on his upper back, shoulders and neck area and by using their knees to hold him down.

Sheku positioned lying on the ground face downwards and a high degree of pressure applied to his trunk, his breathing became restricted and stopped. Mr Bayoh died

in hospital covered with a number of injuries, including

petechial haemorrhages to his eyes and a fractured rib.

The issue of race flows as a river through this

Inquiry. We cannot address the woeful lack of training

available and the attitudes of police officers, whether

conscious or unconscious in biases, in these

submissions, but we have been asked to flag up evidence

which we rely on in the future.

At the start of this Inquiry, senior counsel for the Chief Constable made an opening statement on behalf of Sir Iain Livingstone in which it was stated that they were sending a very clear, strong and clear message that if you hold racist, misogynist or discriminatory views you are unwelcome in policing. The Chief Constable declares that upholding the core values of Police Service of Scotland demands that it be anti-racist.

This statement was welcomed by the families of Sheku Bayoh as they hoped it would shine a light on the actions of Police Scotland on 3 May 2015 and in the days, weeks and months and years that followed.

In May of this year 2023, the Chief Constable of Police Scotland went one step further from his opening statement a year earlier, in that he accepted that Police Scotland was institutionally racist. This declaration was welcomed by the families of Sheku Bayoh

as something that the black, Asian and minority ethnic communities had in fact known for decades.

However, in the case of Sheku Bayoh it will be submitted that a combination of overt and covert racism of police officers, combined with institutional racism and unconscious bias, there was a thread that weaved through the moments from Sheku Bayoh meeting the police until he met his death, until the Lord Advocate made a decision not to prosecute.

Whilst this is very much welcomed, the response of those representing the rank and file exposes the wide chasm of opinion in the police force in relation to race. When speaking about the impact the comments would have made on police morale, David Threadgold, Chair of the Scottish Police Federation, said:

"The use of the phrase 'institutionally racist' is one that has deeply offended and upset them and they do not recognise themselves in that way."

It is noted that in his opening statement senior counsel for PCs Kayleigh Good, Alan Smith and Ashley Tomlinson submitted that race did not influence their actions in any way. That view is reflected in the evidence of the officers who have given evidence before this hearing.

However, several significant race issues arose, not

only in relation to the actions of officers but more
broadly in relation to racism within the police force.

The following is only a small number of the various
issues.

The possible use of racial profiling or racial

The possible use of racial profiling or racial assumptions in considering this may be a terrorist incident. The fact that language was used that is common to racial bias and unconscious racism. The perceptions of the black men being seen as larger or more aggressive such as, "He was the most muscular man I have ever seen", and, "He was massive and is the biggest male I have seen". The fact that officers either did not know or did not understand the use of offensive language like "coloured", language which was described over 20 years ago by the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, report paragraph 6.3 as:

"Use of inappropriate expressions such as 'coloured' or 'negro' fall into that category. The use of such words which are now well-known to be offensive display at least insensitivity and a lack of training. A number of officers used such terms and some did not even during the course of evidence seem to understand that the terms were offensive and should not be used."

We note that this report came out in February 1999, almost quarter of a century ago.

what could be described as a colour blind approach, an approach which is outdated and wholly fails to take into account unconscious racial bias, a matter which

Police Scotland, it seems, does not understand. If officers were to be believed, for example, there was a lack of knowledge of black men dying in police custody being a particular issue. The fact that racist comments about Isis were made in court and on TV. The fact, for example, despite the acknowledgement of senior officers about the evidence of a WhatsApp group which had racist, sexist and homophobic language, where every police officer said if they saw racism they would call it out and/or report it, yet none of the officers involved in such groups appear to do so.

In submissions we address where we say that some officers have not provided credible and reliable information to this Inquiry, that they have lied. We say that this reflects the experiences of the families of Sheku Bayoh, who say they were lied to and not told the truth by officers about the death of their loved one when they were spoken to after he died.

The living reality for the Bayoh family is that five days of protests for Floyd George in the US delivered more than five years of waiting for the

1	Scottish criminal justice system to act. For the
2	families of Sheku Bayoh it is imperative that this
3	Inquiry proceeds with the utmost diligence and care,
4	taking account of all of the relevant evidence and the
5	family remain committed to uncovering the truth, no
6	matter how difficult or uncomfortable that may be for
7	the institutions of our criminal justice system which
8	stand accused of failing Sheku Bayoh and his family.
9	In Scotland a society begins to wake up to an
LO	institutionally racist police force and racial
11	injustice, the families hope that this Inquiry will be
L2	robust in its analysis, searching out and recognising
L3	the existence of racism as a factor in the death of
L 4	Sheku Bayoh.
L5	Sadly, Sheku is not by any means the first black man
L6	to die in police custody but his family still have hope
L7	that his name does not fade from memory and that one day
L8	the name of Sheku Bayoh leaves us a legacy of change and
L9	that his sons Isaac and Tyler can be proud of.
20	Those are the submissions on behalf of the
21	Sheku Bayoh families.
22	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms Mitchell.
23	I think we will take a break now and sit again at
24	11.15.
25	(10.55 am)

1	(Short Break)
2	(11.19 am)
3	LORD BRACADALE: Now on behalf of the Chief Constable of the
4	Police Service of Scotland, Ms Maguire.
5	Submissions by MS MAGUIRE
6	MS MAGUIRE: Thank you, Chair, for this opportunity to make
7	interim closing submissions on behalf of
8	Sir Iain Livingstone QPM, the Chief Constable of the
9	Police Service of Scotland.
10	Written submissions on his behalf were submitted to
11	the Inquiry on 23 June. These are adopted and they will
12	be made available to the public by the Inquiry.
13	Today I will only address one part of those
14	submissions. Because of its importance to policing in
15	Scotland and public confidence in the police, I will
16	focus on the chapter which deals with the issue of race.
17	Before doing so, the Chief Constable has asked that
18	I once again address the families of Mr Bayoh.
19	The Chief Constable is aware that you have attended
20	every hearing from May last year and that you have
21	required to listen to difficult evidence about your
22	loved one, Sheku. You are at the heart of this Inquiry
23	and the Chief Constable wishes to acknowledge the
24	courage, the strength and the dignity you have shown
25	throughout.

The Chief Constable made a commitment to you in his opening statement. When he expressed his support for this Inquiry, he affirmed the mission of Police Scotland to improve the safety and wellbeing of the people and communities of Scotland, including your community, and to do so for the benefit of all citizens.

He wishes to reassure you of the positive steps that have been taken in honouring that commitment.

The Chief Constable has continued to support the Inquiry with absolute candour. He has engaged bespoke resources to provide extensive material and position statements to the Inquiry to assist the Inquiry in all its aims.

He has supported the Inquiry in its investigation to understand what happened in Kirkcaldy on 3 May 2015 and through operational organisation he has facilitated the attendance of officers of Police Scotland to ensure that they have been available as and when the Inquiry has needed them.

Like you, the Chief Constable is determined to support the Inquiry to ascertain and understand fully what happened that day. Organisational learning systems have been developed to respond to the evidence given to the Inquiry, lessons have been learned, continue to be learned, and there will be a constant striving for

1 continuous improvement.

He wishes to reassure you that your experiences have been heard and are informing changes in police practice and procedure and are building awareness.

Although not a matter upon which submissions have been invited, the Chief Constable wishes to state publicly regret for the manner in which the news of the death of Sheku was conveyed to you. This can only have added to the shock and distress for you at the most terrible of times. The officers who gave evidence on this matter were clear that they wished they could have done things differently. The Chief Constable shares this view, which is why Police Scotland is now reviewing and redeveloping the training for communicating with families in tragic circumstances. This forms part of family liaison officer training but the Police Scotland learning, training and development department is now reviewing this from the point of view of probationer and detective training.

I turn now to address the Inquiry on the question of race.

In his opening statement on 11 May last year, the Chief Constable focused on the issue of racism and policing in Scotland. He did this as it is vital to do so to maintain and enhance public confidence in the

1 police. He committed Police Scotland to being 2 anti-racist. 3 Since that opening statement, significant work has 4 continued and programmes are in place to further the 5 anti-racist strategy, to ensure that there is no place for racism in Police Scotland and that racism is 6 7 addressed and challenged at every stage and at every level. 8 On 25 May this year, in an address to the Scottish 9 10 Police Authority, the body to which Police Scotland is accountable, the Chief Constable acknowledged that 11 12 institutional racism, sexism, misogyny and discrimination exist and that Police Scotland is 13 14 institutionally racist and discriminatory. 15 What I propose to address in these oral submissions, under six headings, is the following: 1, the meaning of 16 17 institutional racism and why it was recognised as being present in Police Scotland; 2, what the acknowledgement 18 of it means for members of Police Scotland as 19 20 individuals; 3, the consequences of the acknowledgement 21 for the position of officers involved in this 22 Public Inquiry; 4, the response to the acknowledgement; 5, what is being done by Police Scotland to address 23 institutional discrimination; and finally, what the 24 acknowledgement means for the communities of Scotland. 25

So turning to the first heading, the meaning of institutional racism and why it was recognised. An organisation cannot simply declare itself to be anti-racist. It requires to develop policies, structures and systems, followed by actions to deconstruct racism and address issues of power, justice and inequality. It requires to address and challenge the existence and workings of racism at personal, cultural and institutional levels. It is an intentional approach and includes a challenge to all contributing forms of racism, including historic causes and systemic failures.

This means that there has to be a collective effort to be permanently proactive and accountable for the prevention of discrimination, the advancement of equality of opportunities and fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Any public body such as the Police Service has a legal duty as well as an ethical and moral imperative to have regard to the issue of institutional racism, to be on guard for it, guard against it and address it.

This can only happen if there is a clear understanding of what it is and what it means for an organisation and the consequences of failure to address it openly and

1 transparently. 2 The meaning of institutional racism was given by Sir William Macpherson in the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry 3 in 1999 and it is: 4 "The collective failure of an organisation to 5 provide an appropriate and professional service to 6 7 people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, 8 attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination 9 10 through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness 11 and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority 12 ethnic people." 13 The Macpherson Report emphasised the particular need 14 for police organisations to be aware of the manner in 15 which they communicate and interact with members of communities having regard to their specific needs. 16 17 The Chief Constable considered that it was essential that Police Scotland examined the issue of 18 19 discrimination to a standard which the public have 20 a right to expect. It was a moral and a legal duty. 21 The assessment had to be mature, candid, humble, reflective, relentless, robust and fearless. 22 Acknowledging institutional racism means recognising 23 that discrimination rooted in racism is not to be seen 24 as isolated individual acts, but is often possible 25

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

because of institutional failures. This is not to lose sight of the importance of recognising and addressing explicit racism or direct discrimination. However, a personal act of discrimination cannot be properly understood outwith the institutional setting in which that act has been thought to be acceptable by the perpetrator. Discrimination is institutional when institutions are not doing enough, or are not doing well enough at

preventing discrimination and promoting equality.

It is important to be aware of the intersectionality of all forms of discrimination. One person can suffer discrimination for more than one reason, for example they can be exposed to racism and sexism, or racism and homophobia, or racism and disability discrimination.

The Chief Constable's recognition of institutional discrimination is not confined to racism. There is a clear understanding that there's a need to be aware of and to address the intersectional effect of discrimination and the Chief Constable gave the Police Authority an unequivocal commitment to the recognition of intersectionality when looking at the needs and sensitivities of individual members of communities served by Police Scotland.

To be an anti-racist organisation there has to be

1 a recognition that addressing the question of institutional racism is a dynamic process. 2 3 Police Scotland, as an organisation, has become better 4 informed about racism, the causes of racism and what an 5 organisation needs to do be to be anti-racist. Racism in our culture is as a result of slavery and colonial 6 7 power. It is necessary to deconstruct this and bring about truly transformative change. 8 Addressing institutional racism acknowledges 9 10 history, power and existing privilege. The term "institutional racism", addressed properly 11 12 in an informed way is therefore a guiding principle. It 13 is a commitment to the duty not to lose sight of what is 14 required for an organisation to work towards anti-racism 15 in order for those who have experienced racism to begin to have experiences that are more positive and for them 16 17 to feel confident that those experiences of racism that 18 had not previously been addressed will not be repeated. Yet, it seems that an acknowledgement by an 19 20 institution that it is institutionally racist could at 21 times be sensational and denote only failure and shame. 22 This appears to have resulted in organisations being reluctant to engage properly with the question of the 23 existence of institutional racism and be fearful of it. 24 The Chief Constable acknowledged frankly his own initial 25

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 reluctance when he made his statement to the Police Authority when he said this: 2 3 "Institutional racism, sexism and institutional discrimination have become iconic terms in the vital 4 5 battle to tackle injustice. Police officers and staff, including police leaders, can be conflicted both in 6 7 acknowledging their existence and in using such terms, fearing it would unfairly condemn dedicated and 8 honourable colleagues, or that it means no progress has 9 been made since the 1990s." 10 He recognised and understood that conflict because 11 12 he had experienced that conflict himself over a number of years. He shared the reservation and concerns about 13 14 acknowledging that institutional discrimination exists 15 in policing. 16

However, the Chief Constable was aware that there is considerable power in accepting the existence of institutional racism as properly understood because only then can one assess how real change can be effected throughout the organisation for it to be truly anti-racist.

The Chief Constable was acutely aware that given the essential role policing has in society he had and has a duty to lead, uphold and inspire change that improves the experiences and lives of the public served by

1 the police in Scotland.

Addressing the issue properly is a fundamental requirement of the equality duty. Not to value the meaning and importance of institutional racism is to be underinformed of the social construct and the world in which we live.

The Chief Constable made a commitment to listen to the experiences of the families of Mr Bayoh and members of the community. Having heard the evidence to date, he was satisfied that a proper and fair assessment of the organisational learning and awareness as at 3 May 2015 in the recently formed Police Service of Scotland was such that there was a systemic issue.

This was apparent from the evidence of the families of Mr Bayoh, the evidence that some diversity training did not appear to have been retained, and importantly in the fact that there appeared to be a lack of awareness of some officers of the importance of not treating everyone the same.

That approach to equality fails to address cultural needs, sensitivities and concerns of individuals. He also heard evidence from independent review and internal truth to power sessions that made it clear that discrimination within Police Scotland was regrettably a reality.

21

22

23

24

25

1 Failure in training and systems means that it is an institutional matter. It is a failing of the 2 3 organisation and not individual officers. For these reasons the Chief Constable acknowledged, 4 without reservation, that Police Scotland would come 5 within the definition of institutional racism set out by 6 7 Sir William Macpherson. This acknowledgement was essential to ensure that Police Scotland adheres to its 8 9 core value of anti-racism. Any omission to recognise this in the face of the facts would wholly undermine the 10 aims of Police Scotland to be anti-racist. Such 11 12 a refusal would lack credibility: arrogant, defensive, semantic or ill-informed denial of the existence of 13 14 institutional racism only obstructs progress and serves 15 no legitimate purpose. If a body does not acknowledge institutional racism, how can it work towards becoming 16 17 anti-racist? Police Scotland was the first UK police service to 18 introduce a code of ethics and that will now be made 19 20

Police Scotland was the first UK police service to introduce a code of ethics and that will now be made law. All officers are required to take a statutory oath of office which includes a pledge to discharge their duties with fairness, integrity, diligence and impartiality, to uphold fundamental human rights and to accord equal respect to all people. It is therefore right that he, as Chief Constable, ensured that

Police Scotland continued to lead the way and took this essential step to being an anti-racist service.

The Chief Constable has been part of the leadership team since 2012 prior to the creation of the Police Service of Scotland. He is accountable for the organisation. The work to address issues of racism and discrimination in Police Scotland was undertaken before the start of this Public Inquiry. The acknowledgement of institutional racism at the meeting of the Police Authority was possible only because of the reflective approach taken by the organisation under his leadership which has led to more knowledge and understanding.

In accepting that institutional racism exists in the organisation in which he serves and which he commands, the Chief Constable has chosen a new way, one that is more productive and effective. He has chosen transformative change. The acknowledgement was one which was proper for him as Chief Constable to make under his command, with his informed understanding and following his commitment to effect change.

It will allow successors to the office of Chief

Constable of Police Scotland to continue on a clear path

for the organisation to achieve a new level of

performance for all the communities it serves and to be

anti-racist.

So moving on to the second heading, which is what the acknowledgement means for members of Police Scotland as individuals. In his statement to the Police Authority, the Chief Constable made clear the distinction between individual officers and the collective responsibility of the organisation. It absolutely does not mean that all Police Scotland officers and staff are racist or sexist.

The Chief Constable has great confidence in the

The Chief Constable has great confidence in the character and values of the people in Police Scotland and he was clear that it is an institutional matter for which he as leader has taken responsibility. But the Chief Constable recognised that the acceptance of institutional racism without discernment could lead to every individual member of the organisation feeling, or being labelled as racist by those who misunderstand or misinterpret the definition. He understood that there was a risk that the acknowledgement could result in officers being accused of being racist "because the Chief Constable told us that". He was aware that officers and staff would have to deal with that misrepresentation and whilst he could not withhold the acknowledgement which had to be made, he wanted to be clear in his message to members of Police Scotland.

All officers and staff have been given explanations

1 as to what the acknowledgement of institutional 2 discrimination means and that it is not the same as 3 saying all officers and staff are racist. It is 4 a candid recognition that the organisation needs to do 5 more in respect of education, policies and practice to ensure that everyone gets the service that is their 6 7 right. The Chief Constable calls on all officers and staff 8 9 to reflect on their perceptions and understanding of the 10 meaning of the acknowledgement. An extensive communications programme is in place within 11 12 Police Scotland to facilitate understanding, listen to 13 concerns and encourage engagement. Leaders have been 14 tasked with communicating with officers and staff to 15 address what the acknowledgement means for individual officers. 16 17 Changes in behaviours are already taking place, with an observed confidence in challenging unacceptable 18 behaviour in others, but it is necessary to address 19 20 heading 3, which is the consequences of the 21 acknowledgement for the position of officers involved in 22 the Public Inquiry. The acknowledgement is in relation to the 23 organisation only. The issue as regards individual 24 officers must, in fairness and having regard to the 25

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

Terms of Reference of the Inquiry, be determined by the Chair. Nothing that was said in the Chief Constable's statement to the Authority or to the Inquiry about the organisation should be taken as any comment on whether the actions of any individual officer whose actions are being examined by this Inquiry was influenced by race or perceived race, and that's particularly so of those who are core participants. The position of any individual officer whose actions are being considered by the Chair should not be adversely affected by the acknowledgement of the Chief Constable regarding the matter as it affects the organisation. Turning now to heading 4, which is the response to the Chief Constable's acknowledgement. The

Turning now to heading 4, which is the response to the Chief Constable's acknowledgement. The acknowledgement by those informed of its purpose and incident, including people affected by discrimination, has been welcomed within policing and across society.

Support for the Chief Constable's position was articulated by SEMPER Scotland, the primary staff association which exists to support and represent all minority and ethnic officers and staff within Police Scotland, who said:

"We stand with our Chief Constable in his courageous acknowledgement of institutional racism within

1	Police Scotland. We recognise that work needs to be
2	done to create a truly equitable society and will
3	support efforts towards that goal."
4	The Chair of the Scottish Police Authority,
5	Martyn Evans, in support and recognition of the work
6	which lay behind the statement said that it is the
7	crucial next step for effective organisational
8	development. He said that:
9	"The Authority is confident that this marks that
10	moment for policing, one that moves the focus from
11	continually describing problems within Police Scotland
12	to how it changes."
13	The vice-chair of the external independent reference
14	group, Chris Creegan, in his address to the Police
15	Authority said that:
16	"Police Scotland's intention and commitment has
17	integrity and substance. The fact that this was
18	a judgment by the Police Service of itself was a huge
19	strength, a watershed moment~"
20	And that the impediment to change had been removed.
21	Aberdeen City Council carried a motion unanimously
22	acknowledging how difficult it was for the Chief
23	Constable to make his statement because of the lack of
24	understanding of the terms institutional racism, sexism,
25	misogyny and discrimination. It also acknowledged that

1 the Chief Constable's statement did not suggest that any 2 officer is prejudiced but accepted that to improve 3 Police Scotland as an organisation, initially 4 a statement had to be made of the problem. 5 The Council expressed its full support and thanks to all members of staff at Police Scotland for their work 6 7 in immensely difficult circumstances and recognise their dedication and commitment to public protection. 8 9 Leaders from across the political spectrum expressed 10 public support, including the First Minister, Humza Yousaf. The Scottish labour leader, 11 12 Anas Sarwar MSP, believed the Chief Constable's statement had progressed discussions about institutional 13 14 racism and discrimination. He said: 15 "We cannot pretend that institutional racism, sexism, misogyny and discrimination does not exist in 16 17 many of our public organisations and the first step to addressing that is to acknowledge it." 18 He also noted that a large part of the Chief 19 20 Constable's statement had been lost in the firestorm 21 that followed. That firestorm is exactly the response 22 which has made organisations reluctant to engage properly with the definition and leaders concerned to 23 address it with the candour required. They risk 24 personal attacks, such as have been made on the Chief 25

Constable. 1 2 True leadership means making hard decisions, facing harsh realities and accepting responsibility without 3 4 fear. However, it is vital that there is a shared 5 responsibility of all of us in furthering the understanding of the meaning of the definition of 6 7 institutional discrimination and why there has to be acknowledgement of such discrimination where it exists, 8 if there's to be any hope of a society which is fair for 9 all communities. 10 The definition of institutional racism is a powerful 11 12 tool and a standard with which to work. It shows 13 clearly what needs to be changed in an organisation. It 14 is the duty of the organisation to establish that this 15 is a position of strength, maturity, forward thinking and not a failure or indictment of every member. 16 17 It is not a label to be applied in a pejorative way, it is a recognition of systemic issues in order for them 18 to be addressed. It is a commitment to constant regard 19 20 and review, to enable the service to hold themselves to 21 the standards required by the Macpherson Report, the 22 Equality Act duties and the Scottish specific duties under the regulations under that Act. It is 23 a manifestation of the policing principles. 24 The acknowledged authenticity of the Chief 25

1 Constable's statement is reflective of it having been made from a position of proper understanding of what 2 3 institutional racism is and of education in how it can 4 be addressed effectively. Now, that brings me to heading 5: what is being done 5 by Police Scotland to address institutional 6 7 discrimination. The public will no doubt be concerned as to what the acknowledgement means for Scottish 8 policing in 2023 and for the future. 9 10 Police Scotland has taken the Macpherson definition and used it as a blueprint for action. The issue of 11 12 racism was already being addressed through evidence-based actions, effective leadership, campaigns, 13 14 empathy building, positive narratives, awareness 15 building, legal action and peer support. The very acknowledgement of the institutional nature of 16 17 discrimination is part of the strategy to address 18 racism. 19 What has been described as the rotten apple approach 20 does not address the fundamental root problem of the 21 environment in which such individuals have been permitted to act and this is why it is the institution 22 which needs to acknowledge the root problem in order for 23 it to be addressed. 24 The major engine for change is the Policing Together 25

1 equality, diversity and inclusion strategy, which the 2 Chief Constable introduced in September 2022 when he 3 stated the aim of that strategy, which is: 4 "To build a society where everyone can thrive and 5 flourish and collectively build a country where everyone knows they are safe and secure." 6 7 The Policing Together strategy outlines the action Police Scotland is taking to champion equality and 8 9 inclusion so that it tackles sexism and misogyny and becomes an anti-racist organisation. 10 Deputy Chief Constable Fiona Taylor QPM is providing 11 12 leadership to build and maintain a values-based organisation and to drive improvements, demonstrating 13 14 how policing in Scotland reflects, represents and serves 15 all communities. The Chief Constable has created a new dedicated Assistant Chief Constable role to oversee 16 17 the Policing Together strategy with bespoke organisational resources. Assistant Chief Constable 18 David Duncan has been appointed to lead work in the 19 20 implementation of the strategy. 21 This is to give effect to the Chief Constable's commitment to Police Scotland being an anti-racist and 22 anti-discriminatory service with a culture which 23 reflects its values of integrity, fairness, respect and 24

commitment to upholding human rights.

25

1 Policing Together is a dynamic, integrated, coherent, long-term programme, the purpose of which is 2 3 to embed thorough every part of Police Scotland the 4 fulfilment of that commitment. It addresses what is 5 needed in terms of ethos, commitment and action. There are four pillars which will underpin the work 6 7 of the Policing Together programme going forward. They are mutually supportive and are used collectively and 8 9 interactively on an evolving basis and they are leadership, training, communication and prevention. 10 Fuller detail of the Policing Together strategy is 11 12 set out in the written submissions and the Inquiry will 13 hear more evidence about this in due course, but I will 14 mention some key points today. 15 The executive of Police Scotland has called upon all its leaders to live, lead, support and embed high 16 17 standards, equality training and a focus on values by taking action which includes building and maintaining 18 professional standards and boundaries, publication of 19 20 anonymised details of gross misconduct outcomes, 21 equality and diversity training, and a communications 22 campaign calling on Police Scotland officers and staff to know and live Police Scotland values. 23 People entrusted with positions of leadership must 24 lead the desired culture change. The public has a right 25

to expect that any officer or member of staff employed by Police Scotland will be held to a high standard, otherwise Police Scotland cannot rightly ask them to have confidence in the service.

Training will continue to seek to address racism, misogyny and all forms of discrimination within policing in Scotland. Police Scotland recognises that the majority of officers and staff act in accordance with Police Scotland's values and standards every day. Police Scotland is aware that to continue to deliver excellent service in an ever-changing world, there is more the organisation can learn through continuous professional development.

Training delivery for Policing Together has the depth of support available for colleagues at different stages in their career, ensuring all officers and staff have guidance on how they can role model and lead on the changes required, ultimately delivering the commitments made in the Policing Together strategy.

The way police officers conduct themselves, both on and off-duty, is fundamental to maintaining public confidence and essential to policing by consent. At the heart of Policing Together is the organisation's code of ethics and from this the organisation derives a direct link to values-based policing which reflects and

represents all communities. 1 2 In May last year the Chief Constable reinforced the 3 very clear message that if you hold racist or discriminatory views, you are not welcome in policing. 4 5 The process for vetting at the recruitment stage has been reviewed and revetting is being carried out on 6 7 a systematic basis. These strategies are not projects to be announced 8 9 with fanfare and which will have a finish date. They 10 require continuing commitment to further the aim of Police Scotland to be an anti-discriminatory and 11 12 anti-racist organisation, which will review, reflect, 13 learn and change as required. 14 Since the statement of the Chief Constable to 15 the Police Authority in May this year, action has accelerated. With further understanding has come an 16 17 even more focused drive to purposeful action. Police Scotland will ensure continued scrutiny of 18 19 the effectiveness of the strategies as a crucial part of 20 the perpetual commitment to anti-racism, the collective 21 effort to be permanently proactive and accountable. Police Scotland will be aided and informed by 22 external independent critical groups such as the 23 Independent Reference Group and the Professional 24 Reference Group. 25

I move on finally to ask the question and answer the question: what does the acknowledgement mean for the communities of Scotland? The recognition by the Chief Constable of the existence of institutional racism is intended to be a message of confidence in an organisation that is determined to be an anti-racist service and which is not afraid to face difficult questions. And it is right that this comes from a body with responsibilities for the safety and wellbeing of all communities.

To the communities most affected, it is one of reassurance that it is not an empty statement to be made and then forgotten. It is not said just for today, or for political expediency. It was not imposed upon Police Scotland. It is the organisation's reflective, purposeful statement and commitment. There will be no final point in Police Scotland's own assessment of itself against the Macpherson definition and nor should there be. Racism is as a result of power imbalance. As history has shown, this can re-emerge. It is therefore continuing robust, rigorous commitment which is required and this is an integral part of the core value of being anti-racist.

The power to address racism in policing is vested in every officer of Police Scotland. It cannot always be

left to those who have suffered racism to bear the burden of trying to effect change, no matter how willingly they have carried it for so long. The burden has to be shared and it is a collective responsibility of every one of us.

To members of the Police Scotland community it is also a message from their Chief Constable of confidence in all those who adhere to the core values daily, including that of anti-racism, and who are proud to do so; those who embody, individually and collectively, the respect for the human rights of others and fulfil their statutory obligation of protecting communities and keeping them safe.

He is aware that police officers and staff do incredible things to keep all communities safe, demonstrating professionalism and these shared values and he encourages every officer and member of staff to keep doing so and to show the true meaning of Policing Together for the benefit of all communities.

A great strength of Police Scotland is that officers and staff are drawn from different backgrounds and experiences. What unites them is the shared and non-negotiable set of Police Scotland values. Only by working together will the organisation fulfil its aims.

This recognition of the systemic issues which bring

1 the organisation within the definition of institutional racism will undoubtedly have seemed to be a blow for all 2 those dedicated police officers and staff who give up so 3 4 much of themselves and their personal lives in their 5 vocation to help others. It is not intended to be. 6 7 This acknowledgement demonstrates the professional confidence of the organisation and is made with 8 awareness and understanding of why it is necessary to 9 10 make it to progress to be anti-racist. It is truly a sign of real progress, effective change and the Chief 11 12 Constable's belief in those professional, hard working 13 officers and staff of whom the Chief Constable is proud 14 to serve alongside and to command. Under continued 15 strong leadership they are the ones who will ensure that Police Scotland will always be a police service in which 16 17 the public can have full trust and confidence. That concludes my submissions, Chair, with my thanks 18 19 for the opportunity. 20 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms Maguire. 21 Now, on behalf of Ms Short, PC Walker and the 22 Scottish Police Federation, Dean of Faculty. Submissions by the DEAN OF FACULTY 23 DEAN OF FACULTY: Obliged, my Lord. 24 25 For understandable reasons this Inquiry has focused

1 on the tragedy of the death of Mr Bayoh. Nothing that 2 I say today is intended to suggest that that death was 3 anything other than tragic, but Mr Bayoh's interests are 4 not the only ones in play here. The events of 5 3 May 2015 have had serious impacts on many others. I know that the Inquiry will look at matters 6 7 dispassionately and avoid the temptation to reimagine events with 20/20 hindsight. 8 9 In assessing what happened that day, as has been stressed in our written submission, it is important to 10 recognise the fallibility of human memory. Witnesses 11 12 gave their evidence to the Inquiry seven years after the event. It is crucial that one does not consider that 13 14 evidence in isolation, or uncritically. 15 The best evidence here lies in the contemporaneous and unallied evidence found in the Airwave 16 17 transmissions, in the CCTV and dash cam footage and in the post mortem tests. It is there that the true 18 19 picture emerges and from that true picture it is clear, 20 in my submission, beyond peradventure, that Mr Bayoh 21 voluntarily consumed a significant amount of illicit 22 drugs with a clear and dramatic effect on his mental 23 state. Having done so, he got into a fight with his friend, 24 Mr Saeed. The latter's performance at the Inquiry was 25

1 plainly unhelpful (inaudible - audio skipped) the state of the premises afterwards of Mr Morgan. 2 3 There was a clear violent altercation between 4 Mr Bayoh and Mr Saeed and the evidence of Mr Freemont 5 means that it is likely that Mr Bayoh sustained his rib fracture in the course of that altercation. 6 7 Mr Bayoh then armed himself with a large knife and headed out into the streets of Kirkcaldy. We know this 8 9 from the evidence of Mr Morgan. We know this from the 10 dash cam footage that shows Mr Bayoh carrying a knife. He was on the streets at 7.09 am when he was first 11 12 picked up on the dash cam. 13 Having done so, Mr Bayoh then started to attack 14 passing cars, provoking fear and alarm. The terrifying 15 nature of what he was doing was clearly explained by the nurse, Ms Limbert. 16 17 By 7.15 am, Mr Kolberg and others were calling 999. 18 Mr Kolberg reporting that Mr Bayoh was jumping out, 19 trying to hit other cars, stopping vehicles, jumping on 20 cars, jumping out in front of them, everyone is having 21 to reverse and turn around. A minute later at 7.16 am, Police Constables 22 Tomlinson and Short were asked to attend. They were 23 24 told: "There is a male armed with a knife, African-looking 25

1	male, chasing someone, maybe carrying a knife~"
2	Described as:
3	" big with muscles, about 6 feet tall."
4	And other officers were also deployed.
5	Constables Walker and Paton encountered Mr Bayoh
6	first at 07.20.13. Constables Tomlinson and Short
7	arrived 26 seconds later.
8	Mr Bayoh had by then discarded the knife but all of
9	the evidence indicates that officers require to proceed
10	on the assumption that he remained armed. Nothing else
11	would make sense.
12	Matters escalated very quickly after that.
13	PC Paton's emergency status was activated at 07.20.42
14	followed by PC Tomlinson's at 07.21.19. Within seconds,
15	despite the deployment of CS gas and PAVA spray,
16	Mr Bayoh had violently assaulted then PC Short by
17	punching her to the back of the head, propelling her to
18	the ground.
19	Mr Bayoh had been apprehended by 07.22.10,
20	14 seconds later he was reported by PC Walker to be in
21	cuffs but still struggling. By 07.25.17, three minutes
22	later, Mr Bayoh was reported by PC Smith to be
23	unconscious, breathing but unresponsive.
24	My Lord, none of that can seriously be disputed. It
25	means that Mr Bayoh, doubtless as a result of

24

25

1 self-intoxication, acted in a seriously criminal manner, creating a plain danger to members of the public that 2 3 absolutely had to be addressed by the police. The 4 crucial interactions with Mr Bayoh took place in the 5 space of five minutes. To criticise officers who ran towards the danger he presented when the rest of us 6 7 would run from it would be wholly unwarranted. Of course the Inquiry will want to look at events 8 with extreme care and in what follows I will address the 9 10 main points that seem to be in contention. Firstly, should officers have waited before 11 12 confronting Mr Bayoh? A number of suggestions have been 13 advanced as to how Mr Bayoh might have been dealt with 14 other than by confronting him. None bears scrutiny. 15 A firearms unit was not available within a reasonable time, nor was a dog unit. Resort to either would have 16 17 entailed leaving a man reported to be armed with a knife and attacking passing cars unrestrained for 20 minutes 18 19 or more. Viewed through the eyes of the attending 20 officers at 7.20 am on 3 May, that would have been 21 unconscionable. It would have exposed the public to 22 unacceptable risk. That leaves only the possibility of confinement at 23

the locus. Any suggestion to that effect parts company

with reality. Officers did not know in advance

25

1 precisely where Mr Bayoh was. They encountered him 2 randomly walking briskly and with purpose through an 3 open residential area, an area with multiple houses, and 4 frequented by dog walkers. There was no realistic way 5 in which the officers who encountered him might have contained him -- confined him at the locus. 6 7 We see that from what happened when they did engage with him. He did not respond to verbal commands. 8 9 Instead, he advanced upon officers as they retreated in 10 an attempt to keep distance. Bearing in mind the necessary assumption that he remained in possession of 11 12 a large knife, this must have been terrifying. To 13 propose that he should have been allowed to proceed on 14 whatever journey he was on is, in my submission, 15 ludicrous. To suggest he could meaningfully have been contained in the open space where he was found, without 16 17 endangering passers by, and in a manner that would have led to any other outcome, is equally fanciful. 18 19 The stark fact of the matter is Mr Bayoh presented 20 objectively a high risk of danger to the public. That 21 danger needed to be addressed. If Mr Bayoh had stopped 22 when told to do so, we would not be here. He did not. He advanced on the officers and they responded 23 24 appropriately.

Ultimately, in my submission, the true position is

given by Mr Graves. When he assessed the decision with the benefit of hindsight he expressed the view that the officers did everything correctly: go to the scene, locate the individual, attempt to engage the individual. To stand off and not to engage would have created an unacceptable risk.

The Inquiry has heard evidence that Mr Bayoh was a kind, loving, friendly man who would help anyone who needed it. I do not suggest for a second that there is anything wrong or inaccurate in that description. That was not, however, the man who was on Hayfield Road on 3 May 2015.

With the benefit of hindsight, and solely with the benefit of hindsight, Mr Bayoh was suffering from a constellation of symptoms that would fall within the bracket of acute behavioural disturbance, likely prompted by drug-induced psychosis from the consumption of MDMA and Alpha-PVP.

None of the attending police officers shared any responsibility for his consumption of those drugs. They share no responsibility for his acute presentation in light of that consumption and they share no responsibility for Mr Bayoh obtaining a knife and roaming the streets of Kirkcaldy, placing members of the public at significant risk. It was Mr Bayoh and

Mr Bayoh alone that caused a clear and pressing danger that simply had to be addressed, and it was addressed by officers doing their best in terrifying circumstances that unfolded in a very short period of time.

The micro-analysis that this Inquiry will undertake is understandable, but it is done with the luxury of time and resource and absence of fear that were not available to the officers on Hayfield Road.

The next step in the analysis is the decision to deploy CS gas and PAVA spray. Here again in my submission any criticism would be unwarranted. Mr Bayoh was given clear, audible commands to stop and to get on the ground. We have heard today the video footage played of how loud that command was. He did not comply and he did not comply doubtless because he was in a state of psychosis.

He advanced upon officers who tried to retreat.

That is precisely the sort of situation in which

non-lethal measures such as incapacitant sprays are

meant to be used. Regrettably, and again no doubt

because of the psychosis, those incapacitants did not

work.

Some of the evidence has suggested that a more passive response should have been adopted to the effect that Mr Bayoh should have been asked if he was okay and

1 offered a cup of tea. This again is wholly unrealistic. Police officers do not tackle violent knife crime by 2 asking suspects if they want a cup of tea. In any 3 4 event, we know what would have happened if it something 5 like that had been tried; it was tried by Mr Morgan, to 6 no avail. 7 The suggestion that the police should have attempted a friendly chat is again not one that can be 8 9 countenanced. 10 Next we have the decision to restrain Mr Bayoh. Mr Bayoh was restrained after, on the incontestable 11 12 evidence, he had committed a violent assault on 13 Ms Short, a much smaller female officer who was running 14 away from him. On any view he punched her to the back 15 of the head, propelling her to the ground. At that point he absolutely had to be restrained. Ms Short was 16 17 on the ground in a situation of real peril. Her 18 colleagues had to intervene. 19 Was there a stamp? Much time and effort has been 20 expended in exploring this question. On one view it 21 does not matter. Once Ms Short had been punched to the 22 ground, Mr Bayoh needed to be restrained. There was no other option, whether or not he stamped on her. But 23 I quite accept that evidence -- clear evidence of 24 a stamp has been given and disputed. It is recognised 25

1 that the Inquiry will need to consider that point.

When it does so, in my submission there is no doubt about it: Mr Bayoh stamped on Ms Short as she lay on the ground. Clear evidence of that stamp was given by PCs Walker and Tomlinson. The only eye-witness who said otherwise was Mr Nelson and we know from the evidence that his sight line was hugely impaired. He could have seen nothing below shoulder level, so it is hardly surprising he saw no stamp.

The medical evidence comes nowhere close to ruling out a stamp, so much would turn on unknowns such as the force of the stamp, where it actually landed, the protective effect of body armour, that the medical evidence is only of limited assistance. The Inquiry may, however, find that the evidence of Mr Crawford, despite severe challenges posed by Counsel to the Inquiry, is consistent with a stamp having occurred.

But there is other evidence which puts the matter in my submission beyond any sensible doubt. Firstly, there is the soil evidence. How can it be, looking at matters realistically, that precisely the same soil type was found both on the sole of Mr Bayoh's boots and ingrained into Ms Short's jacket? A situation which required the application of force and cannot have happened, as the Inquiry has heard, by incidental transfer. That is

a coincidence for which there is no sensible explanation

other than the stamp having taken place.

Secondly, and here I again return to the need to check any evidence against the known contemporaneous events, we have the Airwave transmissions. The first indication of any cause for the concern of the wellbeing of Mr Bayoh came at 07.25.17 when PC Smith reported unconsciousness. Almost a minute earlier, at 07.24.24, Sergeant Maxwell initiated a call to control and in that he can clearly be heard to say the following:

"Although there's no visible injuries to PC Short, she has been stomped to the body a few times etc and struck to the head. Can you see if an ambulance can attend ASAP."

At that point in time, within 4 minutes of the interaction with Mr Bayoh starting, there was no reason to think this was anything other than the routine arrest of a suspect. There was no reason to think Mr Bayoh might die. As he had punched Ms Short to the ground there was no embellishment the needed to justify the arrest.

Accordingly, the question the Inquiry has to consider is if there was no stamp, how does one explain what Police Sergeant Maxwell said 4 minutes after the first interaction with Mr Bayoh and a minute before he

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 was noted to be unconscious? To suggest that this was anything other than a report as to what had been 2 observed by those in attendance makes no sense at all. 3 4 The next point I would seek to address is the method 5 of restraint. There is in my submission no sensible criticism of the way in which PC Walker brought Mr Bayoh 6 to the ground. Thereafter he was swiftly restrained. 7 He was on the ground by 07.21, noted as being in cuffs 8 9 by 07.22.24. At 07.23.13, DS Davidson described a big 10 restraint, indicating that leg restraints would be necessary, doubtless because of the ongoing struggles of 11 12 Mr Bayoh. Mr Bayoh became unconscious within 13 two minutes. 14 There is no suggestion of death by asphyxia, there 15 is no question of anyone being anywhere near Mr Bayoh's 16 neck. Contrary to what has been said in certain media, at no point did Mr Bayoh say, "I can't breathe". 17 This was a violent male who we now know to have been 18

This was a violent male who we now know to have been in the grip of drug-induced psychosis, who needed to be arrested, who struggled violently against that arrest. The use of body weight to subdue him was entirely in accordance with training and in the normal run of things it would not have been expected to have any effect other than the subduing of Mr Bayoh.

Next, should the police have acted differently, as

1 Mr Bayoh was in psychosis? There are two answers to this. First, there is no basis for a finding that 2 3 officers should have been able to diagnose psychosis. 4 They're not medics. They were tasked with dealing with 5 a man with a knife. Even if they had medical training, this was still a police matter not a medical one. If 6 7 one wants to test that, I invite the Inquiry to consider the evidence of Ms Limbert, a staff nurse at the 8 9 Victoria Infirmary. She was confronted by Mr Bayoh on 10 Hayfield Road. Her reaction, with all her medical training, was not, "I had best phone an ambulance"; it 11 12 was, "I'm phoning the police". 13 In any event, even if the police had managed to 14 jalouse psychosis, it would have made no difference. 15 A man with a knife -- and I repeat that is the assumption they had to proceed on -- a man with a knife 16 17 needs to be stopped whether or not he is psychotic, 18 indeed particularly if he is psychotic. Someone who is 19 psychotic -- we know from the evidence the Inquiry has 20 heard -- is not in mental crisis in the sense of being 21 depressed. Someone who is psychotic cannot be reasoned 22 with. Someone who is psychotic presents a clear danger to the public and needs to be stopped. 23 As for the suggestion that an ambulance should have 24 25 been in attendance from the off, that cannot be accepted

either. It is well-known that the ambulance service is under unprecedented pressure. To require the police to summon an ambulance whenever a suspect is acting oddly or violently would be distinctly unhelpful.

Next, the actions once Mr Bayoh became unconscious.

Officers have basic first aid training. They followed this to the letter. Mr Bayoh was placed into the recovery position. Once he stopped breathing CPR was started. An ambulance was called as soon as concerns arose. There is no realistic criticism of what happened after the loss of consciousness.

Why did Mr Bayoh die? There were multiple reasons for the death. He would not have died if he had not been restrained by the police, that much is clear. But he would also not have died if he had not taken illicit drugs, if he had not armed himself with a knife, if he had not created a situation in which he needed to be restrained, if he had obeyed lawful commands to stop, if he had not assaulted Ms Short, or if he had not continued to resist arrest so violently.

He was not killed by the police, he died because he created a situation in which he had to be restrained and where he was able to survive -- sorry, unable to survive lawful restraint.

My Lord, by way of brief conclusions to this oral

submission, this was, as I have said already, a tragedy.

It was a tragedy for Mr Bayoh and his family of course and I do not seek to downplay that in any way, but it was also a tragedy for Ms Short, who has lost her career and whose only involvement here was to be the victim of a violent assault. It was a tragedy for the other officers who have been lambasted in the media and under the microscope now for over eight years.

The first and overriding duty of a police officer is the protection of life. Whatever virtues Mr Bayoh displayed previously, on 3 May he acted in a manner that posed risk to life. He took illicit drugs to the point of psychosis, armed himself, took to the streets, attacked passing cars and terrified the public. He created the situation that led to his death. He assaulted a female police officer and created a situation in which he had to be restrained. No one involved wanted Mr Bayoh to die. They only wanted him to cease and desist but he struggled to the end. The anger of the family is understandable but it is misdirected.

The stark reality of the matter is that everything that happened between 7.20 and 7.25 -- and it really is that tiny window of time that matters -- was brought about by what Mr Bayoh had done before then and his

1 interactions with the police thereafter. Everyone is sorry that Mr Bayoh is dead. It is 2 3 a death that no one intended, that no one relishes. It 4 is, as has been repeatedly recognised, tragic, but it is 5 not a tragedy for which those I represent bear any responsibility in law or in morality. They did their 6 7 duty. They responded to a situation that needed to be addressed. They dealt with a rapidly escalating 8 9 incident to the best of their ability and in accordance with their training. The duty of a police officer is 10 not to be perfect, it is to act reasonably and in 11 12 accordance with the law. On any view they did just 13 that. 14 As a final observation, if I may, I would urge the 15 Inquiry to bear in mind the law of unintended consequences. It is all too easy hearing matters in 16 17 intricate detail and with the benefit of hindsight to 18 try and imagine convoluted scenarios in which matters might have proceeded differently. This was a dynamic 19 20 situation. As soon as officers engaged with Mr Bayoh, 21 matters unfolded rapidly. There was little opportunity 22 to do anything differently. That might lead the Inquiry to consider whether 23 officers should have held off in the first instance. 24 That would be a very dangerous suggestion to make. The 25

1 risk of defensive policing is clear. The dangers of a lone individual acting aggressively and erratically 2 3 reported with a knife are equally clear. 4 If one needs an illustration, consider the example 5 provided by Ms Caffrey. She held her team off from attending a knife incident and when they eventually went 6 7 in they discovered an arterial bleed. Given how quickly such a bleed will lead to exsanguination, her decision 8 9 to delay even by a few minutes may well have led to that 10 arterial bleed. That is indeed what happens if police officers are mandated to hold off and not engage: 11 12 people die. 13 For that reason, this Inquiry must take extreme care 14 not to make recommendations based on a minute 15 reassessment of the dynamic events of 3 May, which, rather than addressing the understandable concerns 16 17 arising from the death of Mr Bayoh, instead put officers and members of the public at greater risk. That would 18 19 be an even greater tragedy than the one that brings us 20 here. 21 My Lord, I'm obliged. LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Dean. 22 23 Now, on behalf of Mr Paton, Mr McConnachie. 24 Submissions by MR MCCONNACHIE 25 MR MCCONNACHIE: On behalf of Alan Paton we adopt the

written submissions lodged on 23 June 2023. They

contain our submissions with regard to the conclusions

the Chair should reach based upon the available

evidence, both oral and written.

It is important for the public to understand that the Chair's findings will be based on that evidence and the facts he may infer therefrom and not on the unsubstantiated narrative so often fed to the media over the past eight years by those with an interest to do so.

Whilst our only interest involves Alan Paton, understandably points made by others representing officers relating to some of the issues may also be relevant to him and no doubt, if appropriate, the Chair will have regard to those.

In summary, we consider the evidence has demonstrated that Sheku Bayoh voluntarily ingested illegal drugs and alcohol on the evening of 2 May and into the early hours of 3 May, that this cocktail caused him to act in a strange, concerning and paranoid manner which was a type of behaviour he had previously exhibited when taking illegal drugs.

In the early hours of the morning he left the company of his friends in such a manner that his best friend, Mr Saeed, left to go after him to make sure he was okay.

1 When he caught up with Sheku Bayoh, he was not prepared to be reasoned with, nor was he prepared to be 2 3 calmed down. Mr Bayoh violently attacked his best 4 friend, punching him repeatedly to the head and 5 attacking him with a weapon in the form of a clothes 6 pole. 7 As a consequence, his best friend ran away to escape the violence and was so concerned that he contacted 8 9 Sheku Bayoh's partner. Mr Bayoh then went to his home and armed himself 10 with a large kitchen knife and went out into the public 11 12 streets. Nearby he met a neighbour whom he knew, who 13 offered to help him and who invited him into his home. 14 Sheku Bayoh refused the offer of assistance and indeed 15 poked that neighbour in the stomach with the knife. Neither his best friend, Mr Saeed, nor the neighbour 16 17 who knew him saw reason to call for an ambulance because they felt he was suffering from a mental health crisis. 18 19 Mr Bayoh then strode off and was seen by numerous 20 people who were alarmed by the sight of a powerfully 21 built man striding with a purpose early on a Sunday 22 morning armed with a large kitchen knife. As a consequence, a number of them telephoned the police. 23 Alan Paton was one of the first officers on the 24 scene. He and his colleague had reasonable grounds to 25

suspect that Sheku Bayoh was armed with a potentially lethal weapon. It appears, however, on the evidence, the knife had been discarded moments before Mr Bayoh came into contact with the police.

Alan Paton issued instructions to stop which were ignored. As a consequence, he discharged his CS spray, most of which, it appears, blew back into his own face and incapacitated him for a period when he had no idea what was taking place. By the time he had recovered sufficiently, Mr Bayoh was already on the ground being restrained by officers, he, Sheku Bayoh, having assaulted PC Short, albeit that was unknown to Mr Paton at the time.

Alan Paton's involvement in the restraint was to put his baton forcibly across Sheku Bayoh's bicep. The restraint was of short duration and during it Alan Paton played what might be seen to be a peripheral role.

When it became apparent that Sheku Bayoh was unconscious, Alan Paton attempted to assist his breathing and in all likelihood the injuries subsequently seen around Sheku Bayoh's mouth were caused during the efforts to save his life.

Mr Bayoh died as a result of a combination of his drugs intoxication, whilst struggling during what is submitted to have been a lawful restraint.

The other injuries he was later found to have were
minor and did not contribute to his death.

Various suggestions were made from various witnesses about other options which could have been tried in an effort to de-escalate the situation. It is submitted that whilst no doubt theoretically possible, these were unrealistic in the real world and in the particular circumstances that pertained here.

Indeed, with hindsight it would be reasonable to conclude that any such attempts may well have resulted in potentially serious injury to an officer, or any member of the public who had happened upon the scene.

Of the last two people who had interacted with Mr Bayoh, both of whom he knew and presumably trusted, one was left battered, bruised and running for safety, whilst the other had a large kitchen knife poked into his stomach.

The effect of Sheku Bayoh's interaction with his neighbour who offered him assistance was for Mr Bayoh to head off armed with the large kitchen knife, threatening members of the public and attacking their vehicles.

On the issue of race, which featured certainly in the questioning of Mr Paton, if there was a thought on the part of anyone that this Inquiry was anticipated to reach a pre-determined conclusion about the police,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

racism and its part in this incident, then the announcement by retiring Chief Constable Sir Iain Livingstone as regards institutional racism in the police did nothing to allay those fears. Its content and particularly its timing, having regards to this Inquiry and the Terms of Reference which it has, frankly astonished Mr Paton and as we understand many of his colleagues. He considers that the Chief Constable threw a skunk into the room whilst swiftly closing the door behind him. 10

> This Inquiry will no doubt in due course, on the basis of the evidence which it choses to hear, reach its own conclusion about institutional racism.

Irrespective of that, however, the evidence to this Inquiry has disclosed nothing to support any contention that Sheku Bayoh's race or perceived race had anything at all to do with this incident.

Despite repeated and detailed questioning of the officers involved, particularly Alan Paton, not a shred of evidence has been led to support such a conclusion. In particular, it is submitted that the historical complaints relating to Alan Paton's service as a police officer are wholly irrelevant. The other allegations came from disaffected family members who have used the Bayoh family as a vehicle for their own issues.

Although Alan Paton was questioned about these allegations, their evidence has never been tested and any suggestion about obtaining other evidence from people who knew Alan Paton, both personally and as an officer, has been discouraged.

Despite any evidence, Alan Paton has effectively been on trial for the past eight years through the media and on social media. This Inquiry has heard no credible and reliable evidence to substantiate the allegations repeatedly made against him. Furthermore, and arguably more importantly, there is no evidence at all to support any contention that Sheku Bayoh's race or perceived race played any part in the decisions he made -- he, Alan Paton, made on the morning of 3 May.

We submit that the evidence demonstrates that

Alan Paton did nothing wrong. He went out that morning
on a shift like any other and has not worked since. The
toll on him and his family has been immense.

The Inquiry has the medical evidence to substantiate that and indeed it is submitted has seen it itself from his own evidence and the way in which it was given.

As the learned Dean of Faculty has already mentioned, we the public run from danger and various members of the public ran or drove away from the danger that Sheku Bayoh posed that morning. However, our

Τ	police force, in the execution of their duty, need to
2	run towards the danger we are running away from.
3	Alan Paton and his fellow officers did that.
4	The death of Sheku Bayoh was an unforeseen tragedy
5	but the reality is that on the evidence before this
6	Inquiry he was to a very significant extent the author
7	of his own misfortune.
8	The police, including Alan Paton, were faced with
9	a dynamic set of circumstances where decisions had to be
10	taken as a matter of urgency, where the safety of the
11	officers and the public was paramount. On the evidence
12	the decisions taken were rational and reasonable and
13	were to no extent whatsoever motivated by race.
14	Those conclude the oral submissions on behalf of
15	Mr Paton.
16	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Mr McConnachie.
17	Now, I'm mindful of the need to give the
18	stenographer a break so what I'm going to do I think
19	the best plan is to stop for lunch and try to sit again
20	at 10 to 2.
21	(12.40 pm)
22	(The luncheon adjournment)
23	(1.53 pm)
24	LORD BRACADALE: Now, on behalf of Constables Good, Smith
25	and Tomlinson, Mr Jackson.

1	Submissions by MR JACKSON
2	MR JACKSON: Thank you.
3	The history and sequence of events of this most
4	tragic incident have been rehearsed very fully by the
5	Dean of Faculty and Mr McConnachie. All I want to do is
6	to focus on a few issues which are of particular concern
7	to those I represent.
8	The first one is the stamp, whether there was
9	a stamping on PC Short. That of course is a very big
LO	issue and one of the perhaps few areas where there is
L1	conflicting evidence.
L2	The evidence of Officers Tomlinson and Walker was
L3	that Mr Bayoh stamped on PC Short after knocking her to
L 4	the ground. It is submitted that that evidence should
L5	be accepted. They were both reliable and credible in
L6	giving that evidence, spoke in a straightforward manner
L7	and, I suggest, tried to assist the Inquiry.
L8	The further evidence which is of great importance,
L9	and it has been mentioned already but I remention it,
20	was the transmission by Sergeant Maxwell that
21	Nicole Short had been "stomped to the body and struck or
22	the head". The use of the word "stomped" is quite
23	significant because that is a word that Mr Tomlinson
24	tended to use in his statement and in his evidence, so
25	it is clear that he was saying that immediately. There

was certainly not something made up later.

I am also conscious of course that Mr Nelson, who lived in the ground floor cottage flat, says that the stamp could not have occurred. We deal with that in some detail in our written submission, but I touch it just now. It is noticeable that where he was watching from that he did witness Mr Bayoh walking and the first officers arrive on the scene. He witnessed an officer spray with something and the spray go back into the officer's face, such that he put his hands to his face. He saw Mr Bayoh change direction towards a female police officer who he swung out to hit and he spoke to more than one blow to the policewoman, stumbling back.

I would submit that Mr Nelson is not/was not in a position to assert that the stamp did not happen. By his own admission his view was obscured by the hedge and parked cars. It was his evidence that although he witnessed the punch, he was unable to see where she fell and by his own admission he did not have a view of what happened on the ground, he was unable to see Mr Bayoh's feet.

Furthermore, he did not witness the baton strikes by PC Tomlinson, which I return to, so that confirms he did not witness everything which occurred. Any reasonable witness, I suggest, who by his own admission had an

1 obscure view and had left his window for a period in the midst of a fast-paced incident would accept that the 2 3 stamp was a possibility. He refused to accept that. 4 That steadfast refusal indicates that he was not a reliable witness. 5 So there is clear evidence of a stamp. That 6 7 evidence was not interfered with by the medical evidence, which did not rule out the stamp had occurred. 8 9 Worthy of note possibly that although PC Short was 10 wearing her police issue vest designed to protect from a stab injury, it would have offered some protection 11 12 against blunt force trauma as we have here. 13 The evidence of the stamp was not interfered with by 14 Paul Ryder. Indeed he was helpful in terms of the mark 15 on the vest. Nor was the evidence of Lorna Dawson ruling out the possibility of a stamp. 16 17 There was no need for Officers Tomlinson and Walker to lie about the stamp to justify their use of force. 18 The use of force was justified without the stamp. 19 20 In the face of that evidence, taken together, the 21 eye-witness with the medical and scientific evidence, 22 the evidence of Mr Nelson is simply not credible, nor reliable on this issue. He is simply not in a position 23 to state with any certainty that the stamp did not 24 occur. His account is inaccurate in other respects, as 25

1 we lay out in our submission.
2 Therefore, I submit to you, Chair, that the evidence

4 caution.

My other issue is the striking with the baton by

Officer Tomlinson. That too is a very serious issue

because the use of a baton is always a matter of very

great importance, so I deal with that in some detail.

of Mr Nelson's account should be taken with the utmost

PC Tomlinson arrived with PC Short. He was driving the van. We know the times of arrival and the doors opening, etc. He was unaware of the emergency activation at that point.

By that time both PCs Walker and Paton had been affected by their own spray. The first thing Tomlinson saw, Officer Tomlinson saw, was PC Walker standing in the area in the front of the Transit van, which they referred to as the 19 van. He saw PC Walker put his hands to his face. He formed the opinion that he was doing this because he had been slashed or injured to the face, possibly with a knife. He certainly saw that and thought Walker had been injured and he couldn't see Paton at all so he also may have been injured.

At that point Mr Bayoh was walking with purpose away from PC Walker. He was given the commands to stop, get down on the ground, which were ignored. The object of

these verbal commands was to try and gain some control

of the situation.

Mr Bayoh was ignoring the commands, walking off. He was warned that the spray would be used, that was also ignored. He took a defensive stance and used his spray twice. The first made some contact but had no effect. He was continuing to shout commands which were being ignored and eventually Mr Bayoh turned to face the officer. He felt, the officer did, he was going to be attacked and as he ran towards Officer Tomlinson, Mr Bayoh veered off and ran after Nicole Short.

He witnessed a punch to the back of the head and she fell forward. He described her as lying flat on the road. When she tried to push herself back up he believed -- when she tried to push herself back up, that is when he saw the stamp taking place. He believed that the officer had been killed, or there was an intention to do that and he was clear in his evidence that his PIRC statement on these matters should be taken as it was closer in time to the incident.

He decided therefore to use his baton in defence of both Nicole and himself and he struck to the head area with his baton, first to the back of the head, to the jawline, that didn't do much. He delivered two more in the same area and at that point Mr Bayoh turned round

and he wasn't sure whether the further strikes had connected.

Mr Bayoh was then facing the officer with his fists clenched in a boxing stance. Believing he was about to be attacked, the officer delivered a further two or three baton strikes to the arms. In delivering these strikes the officer was acting clearly, in my submission, in defence of himself and the other officer.

I therefore submit that the use of the baton was justified in the circumstances, given his belief that Mr Bayoh may have been armed with a knife, that PC Walker had been injured, as he believed, the violent attack on Nicole Short and his belief that Sheku Bayoh intended to kill her and his belief that he himself was liable to be harmed.

The other matter I would want to look at fairly briefly, if I may, is the matter of restraint because there are one or two things that are of particular interest to those I represent in that.

On the evidence you have -- and again the Dean of Faculty has been very clear on this -- it is clear that the restraint was necessary, particularly in the context of a situation in which the knife had not been recovered and the aggression towards officers and violence towards Nicole Short.

1 Everyone corroborates the needs for Tomlinson to deliver the baton strike to the Achilles of Mr Bayoh in 2 order to assist in gaining control. This is not 3 4 a tactic deployed in the heat of the moment, it was 5 a considered, proportionate approach to the level of resistance and the real risk of escape when the knife 6 7 was yet to be accounted for. The officers who were there, senior officers, more 8 senior than say PC Smith -- and I come back to him --9 10 did not take any issue with the manner of the restraint. It is suggested that they might have been aware of 11 12 a mental health crisis. We now know that Mr Bayoh's 13 behaviour appeared to be that he had taken drugs and had become paranoid and aggressive as a result but the 14 15 officers could not have known that in this very fast-moving incident. Officers, as was said, are 16 17 responding to the behaviour in front of them. They are not in a position, nor are they qualified, to make 18 a medical diagnosis. They have to deal with the 19 20 behaviour they witness in line with their training and 21 the policies they are required to adhere to on use of 22 force. It is my submission that that is precisely what was done in this situation. 23 What about the level of force applied, because we 24 have heard so many tonnes or whatever it was, half 25

a tonne or something like that. I'm not quite sure how that is actually worked out unless the officers were on top of one another but I do take the point. The restraint was necessary. It was relatively brief.

There was no evidence before this Inquiry that any of the officers whom I represent used excessive force during that restraint and, as our written submission addresses, nothing at post mortem that would support that.

The one final issue is the first aid given because

I think Officer Smith was under some questioning about
that. At the stage where Mr Bayoh was rolled on to his
left-hand side it began to cross Smith's mind that there
might be signs of excited delirium, as he called it,
although he had limited training on that and no
experience of it in practice. It was his evidence that
a period of around 1 minute elapsed between him standing
up, thinking about that and then turning his attention
back to Mr Bayoh and realising he was unconscious.
Other officers were also present.

He monitored Mr Bayoh's breathing, putting his face towards his mouth. He was aware by then that he had been struck on the head with a baton, so he checked for any signs of injury. He continued to monitor, having confirmed that Mr Bayoh was breathing, watching,

checking for changes, able to see his chest was moving, check for reaction by pressing his knuckles into the bone at the top of the chest. Once he realised there was unconsciousness, he summoned an ambulance.

His evidence was that his sole focus then was monitoring and attending to Mr Bayoh. After three or four minutes of that he was concerned that breathing had stopped and so he turned him on to his back and carried out a further check. So in my submission he did everything that was right.

While he took some lead in this matter, he was not the most senior officer there. At least two officers were present who outranked him and who were therefore in it supervisory positions. They saw what he was doing, they did not intervene, they did not instruct him to do anything differently, nor do anything that would have been otherwise done by Mr Smith. They did not instruct, for example, the removal of leg restraints or handcuffs.

I say PC Smith provided appropriate first aid in the recovery position while he was still breathing and then dealing with appropriately when that had changed. In that situation I would submit that Officer Smith did everything he possibly could and that could be demanded of him and is not open to any criticism for either the use of force, the method of restraint, or his attempts

1	to give appropriate first aid assistance.
2	Now, those are the three issues I wanted to deal
3	with in particular and I don't think I will deal with
4	any more because they are covered by others, and indeed
5	I think very fully in our written submissions.
6	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Mr Jackson.
7	On behalf of Sergeant Maxwell and Constables Gibson
8	and McDonough, Ms McCall.
9	Submissions by MS MCCALL
10	MS MCCALL: Thank you, Chair.
11	In the opening submission on behalf of
12	Sergeant Maxwell and Constables Gibson and McDonough,
13	I stated that those officers believe that on 3 May 2015
14	they acted in accordance with their duty as
15	police officers and in accordance with their training.
16	The evidence heard in the Inquiry so far in our
17	submission bears that out. Because you do not intend to
18	issue an interim report we have not in our written
19	submissions set out any proposed recommendations, but we
20	do invite you to make certain findings on the facts thus
21	far and we invite the conclusion that Mr Bayoh, armed
22	with a large knife and confronting motorists in their
23	cars on the public road, presented a significant and
24	immediate risk to the safety of any person who
25	encountered him.

1 We now know of course that Mr Bayoh had taken, 2 perhaps inadvertently it seems, the synthetic cathinone 3 Alpha-PVP and the Inquiry has heard that extreme 4 paranoia and an aggressive reaction are well recognised 5 patterns of behaviour with synthetic cathinones. Now, while psychostimulant intoxication can cause 6 7 these sorts of behavioural changes, we invite you to find that the intoxication was not the sole cause of 8 9 Mr Bayoh's behaviour. You should accept 10 Dr Maurice Lipsedge's retrospective diagnosis of drug-induced psychosis. It is the development of such 11 12 a psychosis that properly and fully explains Mr Bayoh's acutely disturbed behaviour, as experienced by his 13 14 friend Zahid Saeed and as witnessed by those members of 15 the public that called the police. His behaviour was, we accept, entirely out of 16 17 character. He was clearly not himself, but numerous members of the public were so alarmed that they called 18 999. The public rightly expected the police to respond 19 20 and it was the duty of the police to do so. 21 The first call made by the Kolbergs was initially 22 graded by the call handler as a priority 2 call. That's 23 a crime or incident where there is a degree of urgency associated with police action. Unlike a priority 1, it 24

does not require an immediate response. The call

25

1 handler having given it that priority, Constable Masterton in the ACR assigned Short and 2 3 Tomlinson to attend. PC Tomlinson rightly asked if 4 there were any other units available to assist. This 5 was clearly not a priority 2 call. The call that then came from Joyce Joyce was graded 6 7 as a priority 1 and in response to Tomlinson's request and following the transmission by Mr Masterton of what 8 9 he called, "Another grade 1 call", Sergeant Maxwell was 10 correct, we say, to override the decision to deploy only a single police unit. He was right to ask all units to 11 12 attend. You should find that the call was wrongly 13 graded as priority 2 and that Constable Masterton did not initially dispatch appropriate resources. 14 15 We invite you to find that Sergeant Maxwell responded appropriately to the risk identified in the 16 17 calls. He assessed the original call as corroborated by the subsequent calls. He correctly identified it as 18 a high risk incident and threat to life, a priority 1. 19 20 It was clear from the evidence that Sergeant Maxwell followed the usual and expected practice in relation to 21 22 knife calls of this nature. That was confirmed by the police incident officer, Inspector Kay, and also the 23 ACR duty officer, Inspector Stewart. 24 Joanne Caffrey suggested it was wrong to deploy 25

unarmed officers without a clear tactical plan or without orders only to observe. Her criticism is principally directed to the ACR. You should reject her evidence on that point. As we have set out more fully in our written submission, she did not have the appropriate expertise or experience to give opinion evidence on this point. Additionally, her opinion is based on standard operating procedures that did not apply to this situation and her understanding of the command structure was flawed.

As well as asking all units to attend,

Sergeant Maxwell reminded officers of their safety

training. That's the message at 07.17.23. While that

was not required by any SOP in this situation, as

supervisor he was right to reinforce the "stay safe"

approach.

As the Inquiry knows, it was Sergeant Maxwell who requested an ARV and a dog unit. This shows that he carried out an appropriate risk assessment. Both the inspectors on duty, Kay and Stewart, agreed that it was right for Maxwell to seek specialist resources and as Inspector Stewart put it, it demonstrated Maxwell was thinking about the incident in the correct way.

You may wish to conclude based on the evidence of Martin Graves that the control room ought to have taken

the initiative and automatically considered sending an ARV and a dog. There seemed to be some confusion on the part of the controller as to the level of authority required to deploy a dog unit. Certainly the officers attending the incident did not consider that there was clear communication from the control room about whether specialist resources were being deployed and if they were, when they might arrive.

By the time Inspector Stewart made his way back to the overview room to begin his assessment of the need for an ARV, Constables Walker and Paton were turning into Hayfield Road and within about 10 seconds of Mr Stewart's transmission at 07.20.13, Paton and Walker had come upon Mr Bayoh, stopped their van and got out.

When officers attend an incident in the field the Inquiry has heard that they have autonomy to act as they see fit, in accordance of course with the law, their training and any standard operating procedures, and bearing in mind the potential need to justify whatever action they take.

Sergeant Maxwell knew that the two most experienced officers on the shift were attending and were arriving first at Hayfield Road. Until he arrived at the locus and had eyes on for himself, Maxwell was entitled to expect his officers to exercise their discretion

1 appropriately and, if they were unsure, to ask for further instruction from him as a supervisor. 2 3 Like Inspector Stewart and Inspector Kay, 4 Sergeant Maxwell was dependent on feedback from officers 5 already in attendance for him to be able to issue any further instructions. 6 7 Sergeant Maxwell said he accepted getting feedback from those first on the scene. That was a reasonable 8 9 expectation on his part. 10 Having dispatched his team to the incident, as the Inquiry knows, Sergeant Maxwell himself deployed to the 11 12 scene. 13 The situation between Mr Bayoh and those officers 14 initially attending developed extremely quickly and you, 15 Chair, should bear that in mind in reviewing the evidence of what happened. 16 17 Can I turn then to Constables Gibson and McDonough. They were the fourth pair of officers to arrive at the 18 scene on Hayfield Road. By the time they arrived, other 19 20 members of Response Team 4 had located Mr Bayoh, 21 physically engaged with him, Constable Short had been 22 assaulted and Mr Bayoh had been brought to the ground and efforts were ongoing to try and restrain him, 23 including attempts to apply handcuffs. 24 Gibson and McDonough knew they were attending an 25

incident where a man was reported to be in possession of a large knife. They knew an officer had been injured. They knew an emergency button had been pressed. By that point the priority was to gain control over Mr Bayoh so that he was restrained, meaning his arms and legs were under control. The attempted restraint was ongoing, putting everyone involved at risk, until he was under full control.

It was clear to both Gibson and McDonough on arrival that Mr Bayoh was displaying active resistance, pushing up those officers who were attempting to hold him down. The officers already trying to restrain him did not have and were not getting control. Mr Bayoh was kicking out his legs. That Mr Bayoh was actively resisting at that time was confirmed by Kevin Nelson.

In terms of the use of force standard operating procedure, officers can reasonably use force at level 3 to meet active resistance, that is control skills and control skills expressly include the use of leg restraints.

The fact that a number of officers were already attempting to control Mr Bayoh does not mean that Constables Gibson and McDonough should not have got involved. As Martin Graves explained, using up to six officers to try to effect a restraint on the ground is

25

1 a safe methodology. 2 The proper method of applying leg restraints is to 3 have the subject in a prone position and to apply the 4 straps just above the knees and at the ankle. Both the 5 descriptions given by Gibson and McDonough to the Inquiry, as well as Constable Gibson's demonstration of 6 7 the technique to control the legs, were indistinguishable from the trained technique. 8 9 Mr Graves' evidence confirmed the technique demonstrated 10 by Constable Gibson was appropriate. There is no evidence before the Inquiry to suggest that the straps 11 12 were not applied in the appropriate manner. 13 Once the Fast Straps were in place, the 14 preponderance of evidence is that Mr Bayoh was moved on 15 to his side. That is in accordance with the training. So we invite you to conclude that the application of leg 16 17 restraints was performed in accordance with training and 18 that it was a justified and proportionate use of force 19 in terms of the SOP. 20 A number of questions have been asked of witnesses 21 to establish who was in command of the incident on 22 Hayfield Road and we invite you to conclude that the command structure was that Police Inspector Kay had 23 overall command, Sergeant Maxwell was subordinate to him 24

and the constables were supervised by and answerable to

both Maxwell and Kay. But until Sergeant Maxwell arrived at Hayfield Road he was in no better position than Inspector Kay, or indeed Inspector Stewart in the ACR, to risk-assess and issue instructions.

Once he arrived at Hayfield Road we invite you to find that Sergeant Maxwell's decisions and actions were reasonable and appropriate. He was the last Team 4 officer on the scene, arriving at 07.22.29. Within 30 seconds of arriving he contacted the ACR but the controller did not respond. Mr Bayoh was struggling but it was clear to Sergeant Maxwell that the officers were now quickly gaining control and within a very short period the cuffs and Fast Straps were in place and restraint was achieved.

Sergeant Maxwell at that point noted Mr Bayoh had no obvious injuries. He noted that he was placed on his side. He assessed the risk to Mr Bayoh and the officers as low at that point. We say he was right to make that assessment.

Joanne Caffrey appears to criticise Sergeant Maxwell for leaving Constable Smith in control of the monitoring of the restraint of Mr Bayoh. You should reject her criticism. Her opinion was based on the Independent Advisory Panel on Deaths in Custody Common Principles of Safer Restraint. As at May 2015 these had not been

adopted by Police Scotland. Ms Caffrey implicitly criticises Sergeant Maxwell for not taking the role of safety officer on his arrival. She is in our submission wrong to do so. As at May 2015 Police Scotland had not incorporated the role of safety officer into their training or practice. Caffrey's criticism is without proper foundation.

In any event, given their respective levels of service, the undoubted experience and skill set of Constable Smith and that Smith's expertise was evident to Sergeant Maxwell in the actions he was taking, you should conclude that Sergeant Maxwell's assessment of risk and his decision to leave Constable Smith to monitor Mr Bayoh while he checked on Constable Short were reasonable.

Thereafter, when Mr Bayoh was found to be unresponsive and Constable Tomlinson told Smith and Maxwell that he had struck him to the head, Maxwell immediately checked that an ambulance had been summoned and told the ACR about the baton strike.

As soon as Mr Bayoh was seen not to be breathing,
Constable Smith and others began CPR and
Sergeant Maxwell immediately sought to expedite the
ambulance. Dr Pickering said that CPR was started at
the correct time.

25

1 Insofar as it might be suggested that an ambulance ought to have been called before officers began 2 3 an attempt to restrain Mr Bayoh, Sergeant Maxwell, 4 Constable Gibson and Constable McDonough cannot be 5 criticised since they only arrived after Mr Bayoh was on 6 the ground and other officers were attempting to gain 7 control. Ms Caffrey insisted that an ambulance should have 8 9 been called to assist Mr Bayoh sooner than it was and in 10 her opinion when Maxwell called for an ambulance for Constable Short, he should also have called for one for 11 12 Mr Bayoh. 13 That is in our submission an unfair criticism. 14 Sergeant Maxwell did not initially know about the 15 possible head injury. He did not know about the baton strikes. He did not have any realistic opportunity to 16 17 assess whether Mr Bayoh might be suffering from drug intoxication or a mental health crisis, or whether he 18 was displaying acutely disturbed behaviour in the 19 20 90 seconds between calling the ambulance for 21 Constable Short and the point at which Mr Bayoh became 22 unresponsive and an ambulance was called in any event. Sergeant Maxwell chased up the ambulance for 23 Mr Bayoh on three occasions. An ETA was only provided 24

after the third time he did so. The paramedics were not

1	given the information that Sergeant Maxwell provided
2	about the potential for head injury until they arrived
3	and the reasons for that are unknown on the evidence
4	heard to date.
5	It is important, Chair, we say that you assess the
6	decisions and conduct of the officers individually,
7	analysing the situation with which they were each
8	presented and bearing in mind what they themselves knew
9	and indeed what they could not have known.
10	When that approach is adopted, the evidence
11	demonstrates, we say, that Sergeant Maxwell,
12	Constable Gibson and Constable McDonough made
13	appropriate and reasonable decisions at each stage and
14	that their conduct was in line with the law, the
15	standard operating procedures and their training and we
16	invite you to make the findings accordingly.
17	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms McCall.
18	The final oral submission is on behalf of the
19	Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights. Mr Moir.
20	Submissions by MR MOIR
21	MR MOIR: Thank you, sir.
22	CRER thank the Chair for this opportunity to make an
23	oral submission at this stage in the Inquiry and for
24	receiving the substantive written submissions.
25	We continue to acknowledge the dignified way the

family of Mr Bayoh have conducted themselves during the course of the hearings and recognise how difficult this process must be for them.

The submissions by CRER are of a slightly different nature than those made by other core participants in that the written submissions were largely prepared and written by senior staff from CRER. This is in accordance with the wishes of the Inquiry. It is the specialist knowledge of CRER that is sought by the Inquiry.

As was stated in the opening remarks, CRER will be focusing on the role, if any, played by Mr Bayoh's actual or perceived race in the events leading to his death, in how the police dealt with the aftermath and the subsequent investigation into his death.

CRER hopes to assist the Chair in answering the question he must ask himself: would it have made a difference if Mr Bayoh had been white?

Given this focus on the role played by Mr Bayoh's actual or perceived race, it follows that CRER will provide more comments on certain areas of the Inquiry's work than others. CRER appreciates that there will in time be a dedicated hearing focused on the matters of race. Nonetheless, CRER has provided its written submissions on the evidence heard over the past

1 13 months. Racism is a structure which exists at personal, 2 3 social and institutional levels in Scotland. Much of the evidence that the Inquiry has heard has focused on 4 5 the actions and perceived omissions of the officers of Police Scotland. CRER notes that Police Scotland is, on 6 7 the admission of its own Chief Constable, institutionally racist and discriminatory. 8 9 CRER also welcomes the comments made today from senior counsel for the Chief Constable and looks forward 10 to seeing those words turned into action. 11 12 As CRER set out in its opening submission to the 13 Inquiry, the issue of institutional racism was 14 considered by Sir William Macpherson in the Inquiry into 15 the death of Stephen Lawrence. This was referred to this morning by counsel for the Chief Constable but 16 17 bears repeating. Sir William Macpherson considered that institutional racism was: 18 "The collective failure of an organisation to 19 20 provide appropriate and professional service to people 21 because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It 22 can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through 23 unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and 24 racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethic 25

1 people."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CRER submit that the Inquiry's consideration of the events surrounding Mr Bayoh's death must be considered against this background of admitted institutional racism and discrimination in the organisation to which those police officers who dealt with Mr Bayoh and his family in May 2015 belonged.

It is of course not only institutional racism which arises in Scotland. There are other forms of racism, including personal racism, having a prejudice against people from ethnic backgrounds which have been negatively affected by racialisation. Social racism, the combination of power and prejudice which allows racial hierarchies to be created and maintained. This can be seen in attitudes, behaviours and social discourse. Averse racism, a reluctance to engage with black and minority ethnic people and/or a reluctance to engage in racial discourse. Racial bias, an attitude which favours white majority ethnic groups and disfavours black and minority ethnic groups. Racial empathy gap, a type of racial bias in which more empathy and compassion is shown towards people from white majority ethnic groups than towards people from black and minority ethnic groups.

It is submitted that it will be obvious from these

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

definitions and from some of the evidence heard by the Inquiry that racism is not always overt and obvious.

> The Chair will of course recall white police officer after white police officer giving evidence to the Inquiry that they had not witnessed racist comments, jokes or banter within policing. Racist attitudes and behaviour are, however, not always easy to identify and they may take much more subtle forms than direct overt racist language of the type that may be thought to have been consigned to earlier decades. It may, for example, be found in comments referring to "Isis in the station". CRER considers that the Inquiry cannot simply look at individual officers and whether they have used racist language. The role of race in any context is never a matter of simply considering whether someone may be considered to be a racist. Racism is a structure which influences society in the absence of explicit demonstrations of prejudice.

> CRER has identified a key theme arising repeatedly during the course of the evidence. This key theme is racial threat. This is dealt with in detail in both the body of CRER's written submission and the appendix to the submission. Put short, racial threat theory describes how white majority ethnic populations being in the dominant position in society and surround by

1 pervasive racial stereotypes, treat people from 2 negatively racialised groups as a threat. Whilst it is 3 of relevance for other non-white minority ethnic groups, 4 CRER considers that especially in the UK black people 5 are disproportionately affected by perceptions of racial 6 threat. 7 This sense of threat leads institutions and individuals to seek to impose control on black 8 9 populations and the individuals within those 10 communities. It results in black people routinely being treated with less empathy than the majority white 11 12 population, being more readily suspected of wrongdoing, 13 denied the benefit of the doubt and punished more 14 harshly. 15 CRER considers that the issues of racial threat is central to the question which the Chair must ask 16 17 himself: would it have made a difference had Sheku Bayoh been white? 18 In its written submissions CRER seeks to identify 19 20 where the actions of various officers and others 21 involved with Mr Bayoh may be relevant to this question. 22 For example, in a country like Scotland where knife crime remains sadly too prevalent, would reports of 23 a white man in possession of a knife conjure in the 24 minds of officers the murder of drummer Lee Rigby. 25

Would a white man in possession of a knife on a Sunday morning in Hayfield Road in Kirkcaldy be thought of as a potential terrorist incident? Would a white man, who was both smaller and lighter than PCs Paton, Walker and Tomlinson, be thought of by officers who attended at Hayfield Road to be "massive", "the size of a house", and the biggest man that one officer had ever seen? Had Mr Bayoh been white, would officers have considered him to be such a threat that they were required to discharge CS and PAVA spray within seconds of their arrival at Hayfield Road?

CRER considers, as set out in its written submissions, that there is evidence of racial stereotyping on the part of officers who attended Hayfield Road. When comparing the evidence of the manner in which PC Nicole Short was treated by her officers with the manner in which they treated Mr Bayoh, it is submitted that there was a clear racial empathy gap.

Sir, in summary CRER contends that several of the officers who attended Hayfield Road were motivated by a sense of racial threat. Those first to arrive sought to restrain Mr Bayoh within a matter of seconds. There was, it is submitted, a disproportionate use of force against Mr Bayoh. CRER considers that the subsequent

1 events which unfolded on Hayfield Road on that Sunday morning in May 2015 would have been unlikely to have 2 transpired in the same way had Mr Bayoh been white. 3 4 CRER considers that the Inquiry's consideration of 5 race is of the utmost importance due to the potential implications for the future of criminal justice in 6 7 Scotland. It is submitted that some of the evidence before the Inquiry has, despite the welcome words of the 8 9 Chief Constable, highlighted a culture of denial of racism in policing in Scotland. 10 Reforms to ensure that people at risk of facing 11 12 racism, are safe, respected and treated fairly in 13 situations involving police contact are vital. 14 Differential treatment, discrimination and racial bias 15 within policing are not simply a matter of rights, ethics or social values. They do not simply raise 16 17 concerns about policing by consent, or even institutional racism. They are a threat to the life 18 19 opportunities, wellbeing and the very lives of black and 20 minority ethnic people in Scotland. The importance of 21 the Inquiry's remit in regard to matters of race cannot 22 be underestimated. CRER will endeavour to assist the Inquiry to the 23 very best of its abilities as the Chair considers its 24 assessment of the role, if any, played by Mr Bayoh's 25

1	race in the tragic events which unfolded on Sunday
2	3 May 2015.
3	Thank you, sir.
4	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Mr Moir.
5	That completes the oral submissions and I am
6	grateful to all counsel for their written and oral
7	submissions. I am sure that these will assist me in my
8	assessment of the evidence.
9	The Inquiry will now adjourn.
LO	(2.38 pm)
L1	(The Inquiry adjourned)
L2	
L3	
L 4	
L5	
L 6	
L7	
L8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1				
2				INDEX
3	Submissions	by	MS	GRAHAME2
4	Submissions	by	MS	MITCHELL18
5	Submissions	рà	MS	MAGUIRE33
6	Submissions	by	the	e DEAN OF FACULTY58
7	Submissions	bу	MR	MCCONNACHIE74
8	Submissions	рà	MR	JACKSON82
9	Submissions	bу	MS	MCCALL91
LO	Submissions	рÀ	MR	MOIR102
11				
12				
13				
L 4				
L5				
16				
L7				
L8				
L9				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				