1 Thursday, 15 February 2024 2 (10.00 am)3 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Mr McSporran. Would you take 4 the oath. 5 MR JOHN MCSPORRAN (sworn) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 6 7 Questions from MS GRAHAME MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Good morning, Mr McSporran. 8 9 A. Good morning, ma'am. 10 Q. You are John McSporran? A. Yes. 11 12 Q. What age are you? A. I am 65. 13 14 Q. To go through just some of your background experience, 15 you joined the police in 1982? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. You have given a detailed history of your career in paragraph 1 of your Inquiry statement that we will come 18 19 to in a moment. 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. And the Chair can reflect on that at some point. I think by about 1992 you were a sergeant and then 22 23 a detective sergeant in Glasgow? 24 A. Yes. Q. In 1996 you joined Special Branch? 25

1 Α. Yes. In 2000 you were promoted to detective inspector in 2 Q. 3 charge of Scotland's police counter terrorism 4 surveillance capability and led surveillance operations? 5 Α. Yes. In 2004 you were promoted to detective chief inspector 6 Q. 7 in charge of Special Branch? Special Branch Special Operations. 8 Α. 9 Q. You were then seconded in work for the UK Government to work in Africa, and in early 2005 you were posted to 10 Sierra Leone? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 In 2006 you returned from Sierra Leone and you were Q. 14 promoted to detective superintendent in charge of CID in 15 Ayrshire division? 16 Α. Yes. 17 That included, as I understand it, being SIO in murder Q. investigations? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 You had completed the SIO course and the review of major Q. 21 investigations course? 22 Α. Yes. You were later transferred to take charge of covert 23 Q. 24 special operations targeting terrorist and organised crime groups, and supporting murder investigations? 25

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. You were a technical firearms commander and you were
- 3 policy lead for UK policing on data communications?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. You also undertook sensitive enquiries directed by the
- 6 Crown Office into allegations of racism and religious
- 7 abuse by members of football clubs?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. You have been involved with enquiries into allegations
- of racism?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. In 2009 you were transferred to take charge of what was
- then a newly established major investigations team and
- 14 you were SIO in category A murder enquiries and complex
- 15 crimes?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. You retired from the police in 2012?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And then you were recruited, along with another, to the
- 20 police complaints commission Scotland and that was the
- 21 predecessor to PIRC?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. PIRC -- it was created on 1 April 2013?
- 24 A. That is correct.
- Q. Have you had the chance to watch any of the other

- 1 evidence in the Inquiry at all?
- 2 A. I have.
- 3 So you will know that in front of you there should be Q. 4 a folder, and this contains a number of documents 5 including statements and suchlike. If you prefer to use hard copies those are there and available for you. But 6 7 my plan today is to put things on the screen in front of you, and as we are going through pages of documents, 8 9 they will be on the screen, and if you are happy to do 10 so, you can simply look at the screen and I will ask you

questions in relation to what we see.

12 A. Thank you, ma'am.

11

- 13 Q. If there is anything that you think we should have or we
  14 should have available, we will try and find it. If
  15 there is an issue with that or we can't immediately lay
  16 our hands on it we will be able to get it at the next
  17 break. So if there is anything that you are aware of
  18 that you think might help us understand the position,
  19 please let me know and we will do our best to get that.
- 20 A. Thank you.
- Q. Can we put your Inquiry statement on the screen. This
  is actually a written response prepared by you in
  relation what is known as a Rule 8 request from the
  Inquiry team.
- 25 A. That is correct.

- Q. But to make it easier, for me primarily, I am calling these Inquiry statements, and this is your Inquiry
- 3 statement if I can call it that.
- 4 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 5 Q. So your name is at the top, and it is 57 pages long. It
- has been signed by you on every page; is that correct?
- 7 A. That's correct, ma'am.
- 8 Q. If we look at the last page we will see that it was
- 9 signed on 16 August 2023. Your signature is redacted,
- 10 you can see it on the screen, we have the final page on
- 11 the screen now. So you can see that, signed on
- 12 16 August?
- 13 A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. We have redacted your signature, but the copy that you
- have just looked at has your actual signature showing on
- 16 it.
- 17 A. That's correct, ma'am.
- 18 Q. Just above that signature there is a paragraph that
- 19 says:
- "I believe the facts stated in this witness
- 21 statement are true. I understand that this statement
- 22 may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be
- published on the Inquiry's website."
- You knew that when you signed it?
- A. Yes, ma'am.

- 1 Q. As we mentioned a moment ago you retired in 2012 and
- were recruited by the then PCCS and then joined PIRC,
- 3 when it became PIRC, you were part of it on
- 4 1 April 2013.
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. How soon after you had retired from the police did you
- 7 join PCCS?
- 8 A. Approximately three months.
- 9 Q. There is other evidence available to the Chair that
- a number of people were employed prior to PIRC formally
- 11 commencing. And part of their role was to help set
- things up, and get the team established. Was that part
- of what you were doing at the time?
- 14 A. Yes, initially there was only one person to set up
- investigations, that was Mr John Mitchell, who
- I understand you will see later. I was the second
- 17 person recruited to do that.
- 18 Q. Sometimes with the microphones, they are not as loud.
- 19 Perhaps the person sitting next to you could assist and
- 20 maybe bring that slightly closer and we will see if that
- 21 helps, because you are quite quietly spoken and everyone
- in the room needs to hear.
- A. Sorry.
- Q. That is a lot better. That is perfect. Good. We may
- 25 be hearing from Mr Mitchell later in the Inquiry that he

- 1 helped set up. Was he there when you joined?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Thank you. I think in your Inquiry statement you say
- 4 that PIRC were funded by the Scottish Government?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And there was sufficient monies to set up a team, to
- 7 recruit a team of investigators, and that there were
- 8 around 20 people or so to cover Scotland?
- 9 A. Initially there was 20 investigators, a head of
- investigations, who was Irene Scullion, and a director
- of investigations, John Mitchell. So 22 in all but the
- investigations were 20 people.
- Q. This was a new team, investigations was then brought
- into a new organisation called PIRC?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. And as I understand it, that was partly to take account
- of Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights?
- 18 A. Yes. I think I mention it in my statement, that -- and
- 19 you went over it previously during the Inquiry, the five
- 20 principles for independent investigation when Article 2
- and Article 3 are engaged.
- 22 Q. Thank you. We will come on to that again. Then, as
- I understand it, you were initially
- a senior investigator with PIRC?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. We've already heard evidence from Mr Keith Harrower and
- 2 Mr Billy Little, who were deputy senior investigators?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. And they have said you were more senior than they were?
- 5 A. Yes, initially there was two senior investigators,
- 6 myself, and I think it has been mentioned before,
- 7 Mr Casey.
- 8 Q. Yes. We have heard about Richard Casey, I think known
- 9 as Ricky?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Then since 2017 am I correct in saying you have been
- 12 their head of investigations.
- 13 A. Yes, since 2017. I retired on 31 August last year.
- Q. So you were head of investigations from 2017, up until
- the end of August last year?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. And you are now retired?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Thank you. I think in your Inquiry statement you say in
- 20 your role within PIRC you have directed or overseen over
- 21 200 death investigations?
- 22 A. Yes, I did the maths when I committed it to paper, so
- 23 overall 271 death investigations.
- Q. Is there a distinction between directed and overseeing,
- 25 that you could explain to us?

1 Yes, so there are two types of death investigations, there's Crown-instructed death investigation and there 2 is a police-referred death instruction. So if Crown 3 4 instructs we must investigate. If police refer we don't 5 necessarily have to investigate, it will be dependent on the circumstances. So in a police-referred one you will 6 do an assessment to determine whether you need to 7 investigate or are required to investigate. 8 So the number of investigations or number of 9 10 referrals does not necessarily equate to the number of actual investigations, because of that assessment 11 12 process. So when the referral comes in you will assess 13 it, you will ask for additional material, potentially 14 statements, etc, to undertake that assessment to decide 15 whether you are going to investigate it. 16 So that is the assessment phase. I was engaged in most assessments, or the signing off of a lot of 17 assessments. Equally, I would take part in the 18 19 investigation or I would lead the investigation. So 20 there's various stages across that, that is why 271 21 sounds a large number but the actual number of 22 investigations would be less than that. Q. Of the 271 how many were Crown-led investigations, which 23 had to be investigations and how many were referrals 24 from the Chief Constable? 25

- A. That varies. Initially there were more referrals from
  the police. Now I think the majority tend to be Crown
  directed. Equally where we get a referral in from the
  police, and we think it should be investigated, what we
  may do is actually notify Crown and see whether they
  then wish to direct. If they don't, we can proceed to
  investigate anyway, but a Crown direction always trumps
- 9 Q. If the Crown sends you an instruction, you have to investigate?

a police-referred investigation.

11 A. Yes.

8

22

23

24

- Q. So of those 271 referrals or investigations, how many were actual investigations that you were involved in?
- I can't say precisely. What I did do in the preparation 14 Α. 15 of my Rule 8 statement was examine how many I had been involved in since PIRC came into being on 1 April 2013 16 17 up to 5 May, the date of Mr Bayoh's death, and I think 18 there was about~... just over 50. That is assessments, 19 referrals, and investigations. The actual number of 20 investigations that I had been involved in up to that 21 point was 22 death investigations.
  - Q. Of those death investigations -- 22 death investigations that you were involved in, how many involved deaths in police custody or deaths following police contact?
- 25 A. I don't think I broke it down in my Rule 8 statement so

- 1 I couldn't give you a precise number. Deaths in custody are twofold, so what most people would understand is 2 3 a death in a police cell and then as soon as somebody is 4 arrested or restrained or whatever they are actually 5 in effect in custody, and therefore if that person dies that is a death in custody. Then you've got death 6 7 following police contact. So I don't think I broke it down, I didn't undertake that analysis when preparing my 8 9 Rule 8 statement. 10 Q. I appreciate you can't give us a precise figure. From 11 your recollection now, are you able to give us 12 an indication? 13 Probably half and half, about 50/50. That is a rough Α. 14 estimate. 15 So of the 22 deaths, about half were deaths in custody? Q. 16 Α. Yes. And half were deaths following police contact? 17 Q. 18 Α. Yes. 19 And as you have said, were some deaths in cells? Q. 20 Some deaths are in cells but it's considered as soon as Α. 21 a person is arrested or restrained, they are actually in 22 custody, they are no longer free to go about their
- 25 custody.

23

24

business, so that is the definition of in custody.

Therefore, if the person then dies, that is a death in

you a precise number.

- 1 Q. So if around 11 were deaths in custody or thereabouts?
- 2 A. Yes.

8

25

- Q. Can you, again reflecting back, indicate how many were deaths in cells, and how many were not?
- A. That varies year-on-year. Some years you can get four deaths in police cells, some years you might just get one. Going back to 2013, 2014, 2015, I couldn't give
- 9 Q. Do you have an impression now of whether there were more
  10 deaths in cells than deaths during a restraint or
  11 involving officers?
- 12 Α. I think certainly things have progressed and advanced. 13 That is one of the roles of PIRC is to identify 14 challenges, procedural problems, where things can be 15 improved, and to make recommendations to the police. 16 Some of that may arise from the investigation of deaths 17 in custody. So, for example, high risk prisoners are put on constant observations, we've made a number of 18 19 recommendations to improve how constant observations are 20 undertaken, so that the officers doing the constant obs 21 don't miss something and place the person at increased 22 risk because they are a high risk prisoner. So that is part of the role of PIRC is learning and improvement, 23 and also making recommendations to Police Scotland so 24

that they can develop and improve and lessen the risk

- 1 that these things happen.
- 2 Q. So in that period between 1 April 2013 when PIRC was
- 3 created initially and 3 May 2015, so in that period
- 4 prior to the death of Mr Bayoh, can you help us
- 5 understand how many involved deaths where the police
- 6 were involved in a restraint that you had been involved
- 7 in?
- 8 A. I can't give you a precise figure. I think part of the
- 9 challenge when I was doing my Rule 8 statement was going
- 10 back over the statistics, and a lot of the statistics
- from that period the numbers existed but the actual
- 12 circumstances were no longer recorded and that is
- 13 the difficulty I have in being precise about this.
- 14 Q. All right. Thank you. But you were involved with the
- investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. You were also involved at a later date into the fatal
- shooting of an asylum seeker in the hotel in Glasgow?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And you have been involved in other major PIRC
- 21 investigations, you have said?
- 22 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 23 Q. Your statement indicates you were a trained
- 24 post-incident manager?
- 25 A. Yes.

21

22

23

24

25

Was that prior to May 2015 or after? 1 Q. 2 Prior to it. Α. Prior to it. And we have heard that some of the PIRC 3 Q. 4 investigators were what they call PIM-aware but you were 5 actually a trained post-incident manager yourself? Yes, I went down to an English force, from memory 6 Α. 7 I think it was Bedfordshire, what -- between PIRC and Police Scotland, who run the PIM course, we organise one 8 9 day's training for PIRC investigators, to raise their 10 awareness of the post-incident procedures, the PIM 11 process. 12 Q. You have attended numerous post-incident procedures 13 following deaths in custody, you said? Deaths in custody, deaths following police contact, 14 Α. 15 fatal shootings, other police shootings. Then you have also told us that you were asked to 16 Q. 17 undertake a review of the -- what is now the IOPC in 18 England and Wales and you also investigated the 19 Hillsborough Inquiry? The IOPC or the IPCC, as it was at the time, asked PIRC 20 Α.

to undertake a review of their Hillsborough

investigation to see what lessons or improvements could

be made, so myself, John Mitchell, Brian Dodd, and

I think Billy Little, we went down. I authored the

report which was submitted to the IPCC now the IOPC,

14

- identifying various -- providing recommendations for
- 2 areas that they may wish to consider to improve the
- 3 investigation.
- Q. Do you recall when that was?
- 5 A. I have it in my head it was 2014 but it might have
- been ... 2014, 2016, round about that time period.
- 7 Q. Was it before or after Mr Bayoh's death?
- 8 A. I can't recall.
- 9 Q. I would like to ask you about three documents, and you
- 10 have mentioned Article 2 and the importance of that to
- 11 PIRC.
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. I would like you to look at three documents, which
- I have referred Mr Harrower and Mr Little to, so you
- probably have seen me do that.
- 16 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 17 Q. These will come up on the screen. The first is
- 18 PIRC 04446. You will see that this is dated
- 19 12 November 2012. It is entitled.
- 20 "Police Investigations and Review Commissioner.
- "Operational model.
- "Response to Article 2 investigations."
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you recognise that document?
- 25 A. I do.

- Q. Was this a document that was in place by the creation of PIRC in April 2013?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Had you had any training or guidance in relation to this document?
- A. Not so much training or guidance but certainly I had
  read the document, and I also researched the stated
  cases by the European Court in relation to Article 2 and
  Article 3 matters.
- 10 Q. Thank you. Just in general what was the importance of
  11 Article 2 to PIRC?
- 12 I think it's one of our primary functions because there Α. 13 have been -- as you are well aware, ma'am, you are more 14 schooled in the law than I am -- but since 2007 and 15 before that, there has been decisions by the 16 European Court that the police cannot investigate 17 themselves in respect of a death in police custody or 18 death following police contact. That investigation 19 needs to be independent, effective. I think the key 20 decision was from memory Ramsahai v Netherlands in 2007, 21 and in 2009 you had decisions by the European Commission 22 for Human Rights in respect of Article 3 investigations and then in 2010 you had the paper you have referred to 23 throughout this Inquiry, the recommendations and the 24 25 five principles from the European Commissioner for

1 Human Rights. 2 Thank you. Let's go on to page -- page 2, paragraph 5 Q. 3 I am interested in. We have heard some evidence about this document so I won't take you to every paragraph but 4 5 you will see paragraph 5 says: "The Human Rights Act 1998 and obligations imposed 6 7 under Article 2 apply equally to the [police, Crown Office] and PIRC. Where Article 2 is engaged the 8 9 Police Service have a duty to ensure that they conduct themselves in a manner that is consistent with the five 10 procedural obligations that the courts have held to 11 12 exist. 13 These are then listed in bullet points and the first 14 is: 15 "The investigation must be independent insofar as it should have no hierarchical or institutional connection 16 17 to those implicated." 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. The second is: 20 "The investigation must be effective." 21 Now, these are in bold in this document. 22 Α. Yes. Q. You will see that in the paragraph under it, it says: 23 24 "So far as this document is concerned it is the first two obligations that are relevant and which must 25

be observed by the [police] and PIRC under direction of 1 2 [the Crown]." 3 We have heard that those were very significant obligations on PIRC but that wasn't to say the other 4 three should be ignored? 5 6 A. No. 7 Q. Do you agree with that? A. I do agree with that. Part of it, if we look at the 8 9 fourth bullet point: 10 "There must be a sufficient element of public scrutiny." 11 12 Of course, in respect of a Crown-directed 13 investigation we refer all matters to Crown, we don't publish those sort of details, so that is 14 15 the restriction there. If it is a police-referred matter we can publish. And involvement of the next of 16 17 kin, that is key. Q. Why do you say that is key? Because obviously I didn't 18 read the final three: 19 20 "The investigation must be reasonably prompt. 21 "There must be a sufficient element of public scrutiny." 22 23 And it says: 24 "The next of kin must be involved to an appropriate extent." 25

Why do you say that is key? 1 Because they are the relatives of the deceased. 2 Α. 3 Invariably they are traumatised by the death, hugely 4 upset, and you need to involve them, you need to inform 5 them. That is why we have the whole family liaison officers, to support the family of the deceased. It is 6 7 key. Thank you. Can we look at page 8 now. Just very 8 Q. 9 briefly. We see here, "Additional advice for staff". This is in a section called: 10 "PIRC investigators guidance note. Referrals 11 12 involving the police use of firearms." 13 Page 8 says: 14 "If the indications are that the guidance is not 15 going to be complied with we should explain to officers that, in relation to the use of lethal force they should 16 17 record their honestly held belief why they used the force and we should make it clear that conferring is not 18 necessary when recording their own belief. We must be 19 20 clear that we are not seeking for officers to be 21 separated and we understand that they are entitled to legal advice." 22 There is a few matters there. 23 Yes, that is largely coming from the PIP/PIM process. 24 Α. We have asked some witnesses about what happened to the 25 Q.

1 officers on 3 May 2015. They were taken back to the canteen at Kirkcaldy Police Office, but not separated. 2 3 There's some guidance within this document about 4 conferring and separation. 5 Yes. The officers -- there has been a debate, Α. 6 particularly in England and Wales, about separating 7 officers following death in custody, fatal shootings. However, I think it has been held that it is very much 8 9 a matter for the police. As long as there are processes 10 in place to ensure that the officers don't confer and 11 they are given the warning against conferring, and you 12 are ensuring that integrity of the process, that you 13 don't leave them alone so they have got the opportunity. 14 That is part of the PIP process which is -- it's 15 a police process but you have the post-incident manager, you have their deputy, you've got support staff or other 16 17 officers that come in. I have been involved in -- well, you mentioned the 18 19 fatal shooting of the asylum seeker in the hotel in 20 Glasgow. In that case we had 53 key police witnesses, 21 so you have got to find accommodation for them, you need 22 multiple PIMs and support staff, you need multiple PIRC investigation teams, and right upfront they should be 23 given the warning against conferring, sometimes that 24 25 warning might be broadcast over the radio, sometimes we

1 are travelling a distance to -- for example, there was 2 a shooting in Inverness, I was travelling up to 3 Inverness, I spoke to the post-incident manager, 4 I said: have you given the warning about conferring yet? Not yet. Do it. Get it done over the radio. Because 5 officers were in different stations and record the fact 6 7 that it is done. Right. There is a recognition in that paragraph that it 8 Q. 9 says: 10 "We must be clear that we are not seeking for 11 officers to be separated and we understand that they are 12 entitled to legal advice." 13 Yes, legal advice is part of the PIM process. Should Α. 14 they require it. 15 Q. And PIM recognise that that is an option for officers who may wish to take legal advice? 16 Yes. I have been to -- I think sometimes we -- PIP and 17 Α. PIM become interchangeable, so PIP is the process, 18 19 post-incident procedures, PIM is the post-incident 20 manager. But sometimes people think it is post-incident 21 management, so it's interchangeable sometimes. 22 So I have been to post-incident procedures following deaths where there was -- the officers didn't require 23 and didn't seek legal advice, equally I have been to 24 25 post-incident procedures where the officers did seek

1 legal advice. It is very much a matter for the officers themselves to decide. 2 Q. It then goes on to say: 3 4 "Each case will have to be dealt with on its own 5 merits, the underlying principle will be to ensure that our investigation is as effective as it possibly can 6 7 be." That is one of the five principles that you want to 8 carry out? 9 10 Α. Yes. Not just an independent investigation, but also 11 Q. 12 effective or adequate? 13 Α. Yes. 14 "If investigators are confronted with an unwillingness Q. 15 to comply the relevant senior PIRC representative should 16 be consulted." 17 So there is a recognition that there might be some unwillingness on the part of officers but the senior 18 19 PIRC representative should be consulted? 20 Yes. The only example we have is the case of Mr Bayoh's A. 21 death, in all other cases we have been involved in the officers have always given initial accounts or detailed 22 23 statements. This is the only one that that has not 24 happened. Is that your experience throughout your career? 25 Q.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. We've heard that the PIP, the process, envisages
- different steps and procedure, and one of them is
- 4 initial -- basic facts?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Then initial accounts, and then a more detailed
- 7 statement which can be taken around 48 hours later,
- 8 after the event?
- 9 A. Yes, and I think that comes from studies to show that
- when you have a critical incident, when you are involved
- in let's say a fatal shooting or something like that, to
- 12 a certain extent sometimes you get tunnel vision because
- 13 you are focusing on the emergency in front of you, and
- 14 your memory immediately after that is just the focus on
- 15 that critical area. But I think studies have shown that
- with the passage of 48 hours a lot of memory of other
- events comes back and that is why you want the detailed
- 18 statement 48 hours later. The initial account is very
- 19 much to allow the progress of the investigation, so the
- first thing is you have got sit rep, that is stage one.
- Q. Sorry, I didn't catch that?
- 22 A. Sit rep, situation report. A lot of times that from the
- 23 STORM log, and I think we have heard about STORM logs.
- 24 So that is the situation report and the PIM will obtain
- 25 that. Next thing is a PIM basic facts. So the

post-incident manager will get an account from one of the officers, preferably not the key officer that was involved in the use of force or the discharge of firearms but one of the other officers, trying to get basic facts as it what occurred. And then initial accounts from the officers or staff. The initial accounts are just very brief, usually no more than one or two pages, just about. For example: I went, I saw I did, and this is my honestly held belief of my reason to use force, of the necessity to use force. And it's as basic as that.

That then gets passed to, for example ourselves, to allow us to progress the investigation, therefore we have an understanding broadly of what has occurred. And that gets handed to us. And then with the passage of 48 hours, the officers supply what they call their stage four accounts which is their detailed accounts.

Q. Thank you. So going back for a moment to basic facts, you have said it wouldn't be the officers directly involved. Could that be, for example, the police sergeant in charge of the response team, who would go and maybe it's the response team members who carry out a restraint or use force, but he was not -- he was not directly involved with the restraint and the use of force?

- 1 A. Yes. So broadly if somebody is hands on, for want of
- 2 a better expression, or the persons that has discharged
- 3 the shots, the fatal shots, etc, you want somebody that
- 4 has not been hands on or discharged the fatal shots.
- 5 That usually comes from one of the other officers that
- 6 has been there and has observed what has happened.
- 7 Q. So someone who was maybe standing by and observing, but
- 8 not directly involved with what is going on in relation
- 9 to the incidents of force?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And initial accounts, would the process envisage that
- they would be taken from all the officers involved?
- 13 A. Initial accounts are usually obtained from what they
- 14 term key police witnesses, so that is officers that are
- 15 directly involved in the incident. An officer that is
- not directly involved but may have played a peripheral
- 17 role, they are not held to be a key police witness, they
- are not part of the PIP process therefore operational
- 19 statements could be requested from them immediately, and
- 20 that would be full operational statements.
- 21 Q. So in this scenario involving Mr Bayoh, we have heard
- 22 that there were nine officers who attended the scene but
- 23 we also heard about other officers who arrived slightly
- later, towards the end of the incident, one was
- 25 a detective sergeant and one was a detective constable?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. So they were at the scene but not directly involved with
- 3 the restraint itself?
- 4 A. I think also Sergeant Maxwell, who turned up, he was the
- 5 shift sergeant -- Temporary Sergeant Maxwell as he was
- at the time. But he didn't go hands on, therefore
- 7 preferable because the two detectives that turned up
- 8 didn't see the initial -- what had happened, they turned
- 9 up slightly afterwards. So potentially Sergeant Maxwell
- 10 would be the best placed to provide that, the basic
- 11 facts. Because from my recollection, six officers went
- hands on with Mr Bayoh, you had PC Short injured and
- going to hospital. So probably Sergeant Maxwell would
- 14 be the best person to give the PIM basic facts or to
- obtain the PIM basic facts from.
- Q. In terms of initial accounts, key officers, would that
- 17 be the officers involved in the restraint?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And then detailed accounts or statements from everyone
- present, would that be envisaged at 48 hours?
- 21 A. Yes. Of the nine principal officers, you would expect
- 22 detailed statements within -- well, with the passage of
- 48 hours. DC Connell and DS --
- Q. Davidson?
- 25 A. -- Samantha Davidson, I think they gave accounts,

1 detailed accounts, shortly thereafter, because I am aware DC Connell provided a statement to us, I think his 2 3 statement was dated the 4th, so that is the next day. 4 He is the one that actually recovered the knife, but he 5 hadn't been hands on or involved in the restraint or the incident therefore he provided an operational statement. 6 7 I don't know what is -- the Inquiry reference number is but from memory it was statement 22A, taken by PIRC 8 during the course of the Bayoh investigation. 9 We have those numbers but we use our own numbers 10 Q. unfortunately. Thank you. Let's move on from that 11 12 document that we see on the screen and I would like to 13 refer you to another document please and this is 14 a memorandum of understanding which is PIRC 04453. If 15 we can move up the page we see: "Memorandum of understanding between Crown Office 16 17 and PIRC." 18 If we go to the very end of this document first of 19 all -- sorry, there are appendices at the rear, so if we 20 can move back up, please. We will see that this 21 document was signed, the actual signatures are redacted but it was signed for PIRC on 10 December 2013, and 22 signed on behalf of the Crown Office on 23 11 December 2013. So this document had been signed and 24 25 agreed prior to the events in May 2015?

- 1 A. Yes. It has been revised a few times, and developed as
- 2 familiarity with PIRC and our role -- and our role has
- 3 expanded so it has been revised over -- a few times.
- Q. We understand this is the document that was --
- 5 A. In force at the time.
- 6 Q. -- in force in May 2015?
- 7 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 8 Q. Let's go to the top. We noticed the first page. If we
- 9 could start looking at the next section. Memorandum of
- 10 understanding, and you will see on page 2 which we are
- on, if we move down:
- "Role of Crown Office~..."
- 13 And then it says:
- "PIRC statutory responsibilities."
- I think you have spent some time in your Inquiry
- 16 statement explaining the statutory responsibilities and
- how the statute worked in practice?
- 18 A. Yes. The legislation, I think as I have said later on
- in my Rule 8 statement, is incredibly complex and not
- 20 easily understood. As you are aware, dependent on the
- 21 nature of the referral to PIRC, if it comes from Crown
- 22 we have certain powers, if it comes from the police we
- 23 have slightly different powers. And it is difficult to
- 24 disentangle all this because it is really quite complex.
- 25 Q. We see at the bottom of that page, if we can just move

25

1 down slightly, you can see that we have heard there can be referrals from the Chief Constable? 2 3 Α. Yes. 4 And there are Crown-led investigations? 5 Α. Yes. Q. And we can see here -- if we can just see the numbers, 6 7 it's section 2.1 of this document and it refers to section 33A of the 2006 Act, and if we look at (b) this 8 9 relates to where it's direct -- where PIRC is directed 10 by the appropriate prosecutor, so this would be the Crown-led element of the statute? 11 12 A. Yes. Q. And there are two paragraphs. The first we can see here 13 14 which is (b)(i): 15 "To investigate any circumstances in which there is 16 an indication that person serving with the police may 17 have committed an offence." I think that is what other witnesses have described 18 19 as investigating alleged criminal allegations or 20 a potential crime? 21 Α. That is right. So that is Crown-led, into a potential crime? 22 Q. 23 A. Yes. Q. And then (b)(ii), which others have referred to, is 24

about investigating:

"... the circumstances of any death involving 1 a person serving with the police~..." 2 3 And that is an investigation into circumstances of 4 a death --5 Α. Yes. -- where there has been police involvement? 6 Q. 7 Α. Yes. So (b) (i) is the criminal allegations and (b) (ii) is 8 Q. 9 investigating circumstances? 10 Α. Yes. And I think you have spent time explaining that in your 11 Q. 12 statement? 13 Yes, ma'am. Α. Thank you. So again, you are familiar with this 14 Q. 15 document, are you? 16 Α. Yes. Again, was this something that was trained to PIRC 17 Q. investigators when PIRC came into -- when this document 18 19 came into force or is it something that you were 20 expected to read and understand? I am not sure whether it was trained but certainly staff 21 Α. were informed of it, they were expected to read it. It 22 is the basis of our agreement between PIRC and Crown. 23 24 Also to a certain extent it explains the legislation, the different types of investigation we do, so 25

1 investigative staff would need to be aware. If we stay -- can have a look at page 4, section 5.1. 2 Q. 3 This sets out the role of PIRC in investigations and 4 talks about the different powers and 5.2 makes it clear 5 that: "During the course of an investigation PIRC 6 7 investigators will have the powers of a constable." 8 Α. Yes. But we have heard that unlike a constable those powers 9 Q. 10 will end at the end of the working day? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. It sets out at 5.3 that: 13 "The PIRC is independent from any policing body 14 operating within Scotland." 15 Α. Yes. And I think Mr Little gave evidence that it is not just 16 Q. 17 Police Scotland that you are potentially investigating, there's other bodies that you could investigate? 18 That's correct, so Ministry of Defence Police, British 19 Α. 20 Transport Police, Civil Nuclear Constabulary, 21 Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs, Borders, Immigration; 22 anybody that really has enforcement or policing powers comes under the remit of PIRC in Scotland. So you have 23 got these national agencies, the National Crime Agency, 24 for example, they are operating both sides of the border 25

1 but if the incident happens in Scotland to do with these agencies, PIRC investigation. If the incident happens 2 3 in England or Wales, then it is IOPC that investigates. 4 Q. Thank you. Then 5.4: 5 "In order to provide effective investigations, particularly those requiring specialist skills, the PIRC 6 7 may second officers, or members of staff from police forces operating in Scotland or elsewhere within the UK. 8 9 Officers on secondment will be directly supervised and 10 instructed by senior PIRC investigators during the course of investigations. Any decision to second 11 12 specialists will require careful consideration about 13 independence in particular in relation to obligations 14 under ECHR Article 2 and 3 investigations." 15 Α. Yes. So we have heard that it is envisaged that PIRC may not 16 Q. 17 have all the skills that are required in any individual investigation, but you have the authority to second the 18 people who do have the skills? 19 20 We have -- we have never seconded anybody to ourselves Α. 21 from a policing body. When we were setting up PIRC we 22 certainly had a seconded officer but that officer's secondment ceased before PIRC came into being. But we 23 have never seconded anybody because, as you point out 24 here, there is potential -- particularly because it 25

1 is -- you know, the largest policing body in Scotland is Police Scotland, and therefore when it's an Article 2 2 matter potentially there is a real conflict there 3 4 seconding people from Police Scotland to PIRC. 5 What we can do is direct them to undertake certain functions on our behalf, particularly you've got the 6 7 geographic nature of Scotland and PIRC covers the whole of Scotland, 24/7, 365. We have had incidents happening 8 in the Orkney Islands, Shetland Islands, the 9 10 Outer Hebrides, Thurso, Inverness. It is going to take us a number of hours or a day to get to those locations, 11 12 therefore you cannot simply freeze everything. You may 13 have to task people in Police Scotland -- for example 14 scene managers, various other specialists -- to 15 undertake functions on your behalf. You will examine what they have done once you get there to make sure they 16 17 have ticked all the right boxes, certainly a few times 18 when we are travelling to an incident you are speaking 19 to the specialists, and saying: look, have you done 20 this, have you done that, can you do this on our behalf? 21 Because you simply can't hit the pause button due to the 22 practicalities until we get there, so we can direct them to undertake functions on our behalf and we can then 23

Q. So you or PIRC can take steps to preserve the evidence

check that they have done that effectively.

24

25

in relation to any aspect of an investigation, pending
your arrival, depending on the geographical limitations?

A. Yes. If it is a death in custody in a police cell, you
can just lock down that cell. We have had before where
we have locked down an entire wing of a cell block. But

if the death in custody occurs outside in the street,

for example, the practicalities of freezing everything

8 at that point just don't exist. You know, you've got

a person dead in the street, you are not going to wait

five, six, seven, eight hours for us to turn up, you

11 need to move on that.

Equally there if there's evidence lying around, sometimes it is practical it protect it by putting a cordon around the scene. But equally you've got to take into account weather conditions. If you take for example the death of Mr Bayoh, that Sunday morning it was raining heavily, so the practicalities of protecting a scene when you've got inclement weather, you have really got to move quite quick on it and we will then come along later on and just check what they have done.

Q. Is there an expectation in the situation you are describing that police officers will preserve the evidence in a forensic way or that they will install tents over items, or do you have any direction to

21

22

23

24

25

1 provide in relation to that? 2 We do have some direction. I go back to an example we Α. 3 touched on earlier, which was the fatal shooting of the 4 asylum seeker in the hotel in Glasgow. After the 5 shooting occurred his body was taken out, it was taken to a bus stop effectively, where they tried medical 6 7 intervention to save his life. That failed, and that area was then protected until ourselves and 8 9 Police Scotland scene managers could get to it and the 10 body then got transported to the mortuary. So sometimes 11 it is practical to do it, other times it not practical. 12 In terms of directing the way that a scene is preserved, Q. 13 is that something that PIRC have input into? Yes. Sometimes scenes can be quite complex. And there 14 Α. 15 can be -- I don't know whether it's the right choice of phrase, the division of the spoils. So for example --16 17 and I will go back to the shooting of the asylum seeker in the hotel in Glasgow. He had stabbed five people. 18 19 Up to that point -- now we can't investigate the 20 actions -- his actions in stabbing those persons. That

is an enquiry for Police Scotland. Police Scotland then

investigate those incidents because we are investigating

the actions of the officers. But frequently what you've

got is -- sorry about that, I keep hitting that, I speak

discharged Tasers and discharged firearms, we can

35

1 with my hands, so forgive me. 2 But sometimes those scenes are like dual scenes, so 3 we are investigating one aspect of what happened at that 4 the scene and the police might be investigating another 5 aspect, so what you have got to do is get the scene managers to co-ordinate, and sometimes prioritise who is 6 7 doing what first to achieve the best outcome. So there can be parallel investigations, if you like, 8 Q. 9 going on at one scene? 10 Α. Yes. One aspect being investigated by the police, the other 11 Q. 12 aspect being investigated by PIRC? 13 Yes, and that happens more than you would think. There Α. 14 was a shooting up in Inverness, I think it is -- the 15 whole thing is concluded now, the person has been -- not 16 so much found guilty but remanded to the state hospital. 17 But you have a whole series of incidents leading up to 18 the shooting by the police so the police will 19 investigate the series of incidents leading up to it and 20 we will investigate the shooting. But both occurred at the same location so you've got a dual location to 21 22 examine. Q. Does that involve communication, effective communication 23

between the police and PIRC in those situations?

25 A. Yes.

24

- Q. Can I go back to the paragraph we were looking act, 5.4.
  You said that PIRC have never seconded anyone but we've also heard that PIRC may require to rely on support from Police Scotland officers, and you have talked about a scenario where geographically PIRC are going to take some time to arrive at a scene and officers will assist
- 8 A. Yes.

7

24

25

9 Q. Can you explain a little about the rationale between -10 the difference between seconding someone to PIRC, which
11 has never been done and there are concerns about
12 independence, but relying on the support of police
13 officers?

in preserving the evidence at that scene.

I think because you are then checking their work, so you 14 Α. 15 have -- particularly outwith office hours, for want of a better expression, we have small teams on call 16 17 therefore you don't have all the specialisms. Therefore 18 you are asking for the assistance of Police Scotland to 19 deploy some of their specialists, but you are then 20 checking their work. You might be speaking to them as 21 you are travelling towards that location, when you get 22 there you say: what have you done? I have done X, Y, Z. Okay, can you also do A, B and C. 23

So you are checking that that work and making sure that they have completed that task. You would certainly

- not be asking one of the principal officers involved to
  do anything like that. It would be staff brought in
  that were not involved in the incident itself.
  - Q. Would that be for a minimum period or a distinct task rather than bringing them into PIRC on secondment?
  - A. You wouldn't bring them in on secondment. Usually it is within the first 24/48 hours they are doing those tasks on our behalf because we simply don't have the resources, and we need to muster resources, we need to get them to the location. There is a lot of logistics involved so if you are going up to Inverness for a large-scale enquiry you simply just don't go. If you know it then it's like we need to book hotels, we need additional vehicles, staff need to take a change of clothes, there's logistics involved in trying to achieve that, which is also another factor that comes into play.

Sometimes you might be on the road and you just: right, fine I am going and you will travel and it might take three or four hours to get there. You then might manage the initial response or oversee what the police are doing, knowing that the next morning you are going to have additional officers, additional PIRC staff in who have those specialisms so you are trying to manage that in that interim period by gaining assistance from specialists within the police.

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So is it envisaged that although you may require to
  initially rely on support from the police, whether
  managing the scene or holding the fort if you like until
  PIRC arrive, is that seen as a temporary arrangement,
  temporary support from Police Scotland?
- 6 In most instances, yes. That is why PIRC has employed Α. 7 people with various specialisms, so previous experience in scene management, you spoke to Mr Lewis, he worked in 8 9 roads policing, he was involved in road crash and deaths 10 investigations in that regard, people with firearms experience, people with experience of custody, family 11 12 liaison. So people with those experiences. But 13 we don't have all the specialisms, it's a small 14 organisation, so for example we can't undertake cyber 15 matters, we just don't have that capability, so you will rely on cyber crime in Police Scotland because you 16 17 simply don't have those specialisms, we are not large enough and we are not funded to do that. 18
  - Q. Any other areas where you don't have specialist staff to assist?
    - A. I think because of our restricted role in undertaking death investigations or other such things, most of the specialisms that we require we have. There's all sorts of diverse specialisms within the police because they have so many other purposes other than PIRC, therefore

1 they have a lot of additional specialists. And that --2 we may never get involved in that type of investigation. 3 So we focus on the key areas that matter to ourselves, 4 which is the ones I have highlighted. 5 Thank you. Then going back to this memorandum, do you Q. see 5.5 on the screen. It says: 6 7 "PIRC investigations are intended to comply with the five principles of effective investigation outlined by 8 9 ECHR, namely; independence, adequacy, promptness and so 10 far as possible public scrutiny and victim involvement." 11 Α. Yes, ma'am. 12 Q. So again this is mirroring the previous document we 13 looked at with the five principles? Yes. 14 Α. 15 So that is integral to the work of PIRC and the Q. 16 investigations that are carried out? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Is that something that is trained to staff when they Q. 19 join PIRC? I don't know whether you would actually call it trained 20 Α. 21 to staff because we have an induction process for all 22 new staff but that is largely to teach them the way PIRC operates, HR, all that sort of stuff. But if they join 23 investigations if they do not have previous experience 24

certainly we walk them through our processes and the

1 reasons for it. A lot of it becomes on-the-job training, but they certainly become aware of it very 2 3 quickly. 4 Q. Thank you. Can I ask you to look at a third document, 5 please, which is PIRC 04438. There is no date on this actual document, it's not signed but the Inquiry has 6 7 been advised by PIRC that this was dated 17 June 2014. So prior to Mr Bayoh's death and after PIRC had been 8 9 created. You will see on page 1: 10 "This paper [was designed] to take cognisance of the report by His Honour Judge Keith Cutler 11 12 Assistant Coroner on the 29th May 2014 in respect of the 13 shooting of Mark Duggan by the Metropolitan Police." 14 Do you see that? 15 Α. Yes. You do recognise this document? 16 Q. I think so. I don't know who authored it. It might 17 Α. even have been me. 18 19 Q. All right. 20 Because it certainly -- I was aware of the Duggan thing Α. 21 and I had researched the decision in Duggan. I can't remember who drafted it but I certainly wrote quite 22 a few of these. Whether I wrote this one I don't 23 remember, but I certainly remember this report itself. 24 Q. Excellent. So there has been a number of concerns 25

1 raised by the IPCC and it says in the final sentence: 2 "The purpose of this document is to identify 3 learning opportunities and give clear guidance of what 4 is expected of the PIRC Investigation Team following such a shooting by officers of Police Scotland." 5 So this was a document designed to identify learning 6 7 opportunities and give guidance. Was that something that was done in PIRC before May 2015, documents were 8 9 prepared for that purpose? 10 Α. Yes. Because sometimes I think we described it as learning the lessons so if there was a significant case 11 12 from England and Wales that could potentially occur in Scotland we would learn those lessons and we would 13 14 cascade some of that learning. But equally there was 15 the transition to post-incident procedures which prior to 2014/2015 were solely for firearms incidents in 16 17 Scotland. There was that gradual transition to them now being applied to potentially any serious incident, 18 particularly a death. So I think the first time it was 19 20 used or attempted to be used was in relation to 21 Mr Bayoh's death, but prior to that it was only for 22 police shootings. Thank you. The next section is, "Investigative 23 Q. function". And again this talks about the initial 24 25 stages after the discharge of a police firearm. It

1		says:
2		" Police Scotland must in line with the
3		European Convention on Human Rights Article 2, take
4		all appropriate steps to reduce any possible risks of
5		the investigation being undermined by any deficiencies
6		such as failing to secure all available evidence."
7		Then it says:
8		"The responsibility for securing evidence and taking
9		appropriate action in an Article 2 investigation remains
10		with Police Scotland until such time as the PIRC has
11		taken over conduct of the investigation."
12		Is that what you were talking about a moment ago
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	where police continue to preserve a scene for the
15		purposes of preserving the best evidence, until PIRC
16		arrive in the location and are able to take control?
17	Α.	Yes. Sometimes if you've got complex scenes you lock
18		down the scene, you will ask that police officers stand
19		by on the cordon, lock it down where potentially
20		possible. So, again I will use the example of the fatal
21		shooting in the hotel in Glasgow. That scene was locked
22		down because it was going to be a complex scene to
23		examine. We had to cut walls apart trying to recover
24		bullets, etc, so there was a whole range of complexities
25		that and that could take place over a number of days

1 so if you can lock it down and secure it sometimes that 2 is the best approach, sometimes it is not always 3 possible. 4 I am interested in this phrase: Q. "... until such time as the PIRC has taken over 5 conduct of the investigation." 6 7 Is that -- that point where PIRC take over conduct of the investigation, is that from the moment PIRC 8 9 receive the call from Crown Office saying: do 10 a Crown-led investigation, or is it from the point that PIRC arrive at the scene? 11 12 No, it's from the point that we get the instruction from Α. 13 Crown. Equally, if we go into the practicalities 14 sometimes what will happen is the police will refer 15 a death or serious incident to PIRC, we might examine it, we might notify Crown, and Crown say: fine, we're 16 17 now directing to you investigate. Equally we might go back to police and say: Crown are not directing us but 18 19 we have decided to investigate. So it's at the point of 20 notification to the police, not at the point of our 21 arrival. At the point of notification this is now 22 a PIRC investigation. Q. And that is in a referral scenario. In a Crown-led 23 investigation, is it the point at which the Crown send 24 25 you the instruction?

1 Α. We can -- frequently what you get is a verbal 2 instruction and that is then backed up by a letter of 3 instruction maybe next day, a couple of days later, 4 dependent on whether it's during office hours, etc. And 5 usually that letter of instruction, the actual letter of instruction will give the terms of reference, what they 6 7 are directing that we investigate. But outwith office hours or even during office hours, quite frequently we 8 9 get a verbal instruction from Crown and it will then be 10 backed up by a letter. So in terms of that paragraph, the responsibility for 11 Q. 12 securing evidence and taking appropriate action in 13 an Article 2 investigation remains with Police Scotland 14 until effectively PIRC have had the call from 15 Crown Office? 16 Α. Yes. Thank you. Then at that point responsibility passes to 17 Q. PIRC? 18 19 Yes. Α. 20 Q. Then: 21 "Police Scotland use of firearms." If we look at that: 22 "Police use of a firearm can be defined as: 23 24 "Discharge of a firearm." But it can also include Taser or discharge of CS 25

1 gas. Yes. So you have conventional firearms and what might 2 Α. 3 be considered conventional firearms, so that's guns, 4 shotguns, etc, you've got Taser obviously. But it's 5 an anomaly within the legislation, again CS gas or PAVA as it is, falls within section 5 of the Firearms Act 6 7 1968, it's the definition of what is a prohibited weapon, and it includes anything designed to discharge 8 9 a noxious liquid. So potentially whoever was drafting the legislation missed the fact that CS/PAVA actually 10 11 constitutes a firearm and therefore all these get 12 referred to PIRC. I am not aware of a similar requirement in England 13 and Wales, unless of course there is further like 14 15 serious injury or death or whatever. So again there is a slight anomaly within there. But certainly discharge 16 17 of a conventional firearm nearly always leads to 18 investigation. Q. In terms of the events involving Mr Bayoh in May 2015 we 19 20 have heard evidence there was a discharge of CS gas. 21 Would that have meant that this document would be 22 applicable in relation to the events at Hayfield Road on 3 May? 23 A. I think the Crown instruction to investigate trumps any 24

police referral. So the PIRC have instructed us to

1 investigate a death, consequently the police need to refer. Discharge of CS gas falls into abeyance really 2 3 because the Crown direction will include us 4 investigating all aspects of what occurred, which will 5 include the discharge of CS and PAVA. Q. If we look back to the top of the page, this is: 6 7 "PIRC independent investigative processes following police use of firearms." 8 9 Right at the top, please. It's PIRC independent 10 investigative processes after the police have used a firearm which can include circumstances involving 11 12 discharge of CS spray. When you mentioned it a moment 13 ago you said a Crown-led investigation trumps 14 a referral. 15 Α. Yes. This doesn't seem to be restricted just to referrals. 16 Q. 17 So would this document apply to either investigation, 18 whether it's a Crown-led investigation or arising out of 19 a police referral? 20 Yes, certainly the way the legislation is framed is the Α. 21 police need to refer to PIRC all incidents where 22 firearms are used or discharged, and that includes CS/PAVA. So that is a requirement in law. But the fact 23 is Crown have then instructed: investigate the death, 24 investigate all the circumstances. So you will examine 25

1 automatically what has occurred, including the discharge of CS and PAVA. 2 3 It is my opinion, and I'm not a legal expert I am 4 not a lawyer, but there is still a requirement for 5 Police Scotland to notify us that CS/PAVA has been discharged. Now, that did occur, because my 6 7 understanding is that Keith Harrower got told on day one when he turned that up CS and PAVA had been used, so 8 9 they did fulfil their legal obligation. The standard 10 method is they actually commit that to paper and send us a form, which is usually completed by the officers that 11 12 discharged it or their supervisor. But the legislation 13 doesn't say you must fill out the paperwork or complete 14 a form, just you must notify PIRC. 15 Q. So to go back to the first point, even if there hadn't been a discharge of CS spray in relation to 16 17 Hayfield Road, the minute Crown said you've to investigate, that was the point at which PIRC would 18 investigate regardless? 19 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. Although it was still important for -- it was still 22 required for Police Scotland to intimate that spray, CS spray has been discharged? 23 24 Α. Yes. 25 Q. And that was then told to Keith Harrower --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- on the day, he became aware of that on the day and
- 3 that was sufficient to comply with their legal
- 4 requirements under the legislation?
- 5 A. Yes, and usually when CS/PAVA has been discharged and we
- 6 are investigating we will ask that the CS or PAVA
- 7 canisters are then weighed. They should be weighed at
- 8 the start of a shift to know how much liquid is within
- 9 them, and if they are discharged they should be then
- 10 weighed following the discharge, so that we can tell how
- 11 much liquid has actually been used during the incident.
- 12 Q. We heard some evidence from Mr Little about this, that
- also the canisters are allocated to individual officers.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And I think to summarise my understanding of his
- 16 evidence, that then allows you to see who has used
- a canister that was attributed to them, and how much
- 18 liquid or spray was discharged from that canister?
- 19 A. Yes, officers are based at police stations. Usually you
- 20 have a cabinet at the police station that you are based
- in, in which is your CS/PAVA stray and you have a key
- 22 that unlocks it. And at the end of your shift you put
- 23 it back into that cabinet. Part of the challenge is
- 24 that take for example officers that are getting drafted
- 25 in from different divisions to assist Glasgow policing

- 1 division, they might not start at their home station therefore they might not get access to their own 2 3 individual CS or PAVA, they might need to be supplied 4 with it at the station that they are attending, 5 therefore there are spare supplies kept. So it's not always on an individual basis, it depends on the nature 6 7 of -- the favourite one is football, you know, big games either in the west of Scotland or east of Scotland, you 8 9 might get officers drafted in from wherever to assist 10 with the policing of that event. But the officers might be told: well, don't go to your home station, report to 11 12 this station and start there. Therefore they won't have 13 access to their individual CS/PAVA. But if they are given a CS spray to go to the football 14 Q. 15 match, would there be normally a record kept of who has
  - been given a CS spray?
- There should be. I am not certain it always occurs. 17 Α. But then I have not examined that. 18
- 19 So in terms of gathering in evidence that might assist Q. 20 an investigation where there has been a discharge, the 21 forms are only one element of evidence that could be 22 recovered. There's the weighing and determination of has the spray been us used, how much does it way now, 23 how much did it weigh earlier and what is the 24 difference? 25

1 Α. Yes. So there are two different avenues of investigation open 2 Q. 3 to PIRC potentially there? Yes. For example each year there is usually 200 to 300 4 Α. 5 referrals of CS/PAVA. There is not a lot of investigation into them because it gets used most days. 6 7 MS GRAHAME: I wonder if you could just give me a moment, 8 please. 9 I wonder if it would be possible to adjourn slightly 10 early, if that is a possibility? LORD BRACADALE: Certainly. We can stop now and take 11 12 a 20-minute break. 13 (11.17 am)14 (A short break) 15 (11.45 am) 16 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 17 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Just before the break we were talking about the discharge of CS spray. You explained 18 that there are different elements of evidence that might 19 20 be available, both the weighing of the canister, the 21 comparison with the records of what it weighed 22 originally, how much liquid has been used, that type of 23 thing. 24 Yes. Α. Q. But there was also the form, the forms that were 25

- 1 completed?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. You spoke about how on 3 May Keith Harrower was advised
- 4 that CS spray has been discharged or became aware that
- 5 CS spray has been discharged?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. I am interested in looking at that in a little bit more
- 8 detail, if I may.
- 9 A. Of course.
- 10 Q. We have heard evidence that police officers, they can
- 11 use force, but if they do use force operationally, that
- 12 they must justify that.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. That is in relation to every single use of force --
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. -- that is adopted. So that means as we have heard
- evidence, if they strike a baton three times, they have
- 18 to justify every individual strike of that baton?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Is that right?
- 21 A. I think the one exception is handcuffing. So
- 22 handcuffing has the effect -- it is sometimes a use of
- force, but you don't need to report that.
- Q. Thank you. We have heard of that use of force, in order
- 25 to justify it, and in order for that to be legal, it has

- 1 to be reasonable and proportionate and necessary?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. And we've also heard evidence about something called preclusion, where you have to use the absolute minimum
- force so you have to have either ruled out a lower level
- of force before you adopt a higher level, or take the
- 7 view that from the circumstances it wouldn't be
- 8 worthwhile using that lower level of force?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- 10 Q. Is that correct?
- 11 A. Sometimes that is a very quick process, the officer
- 12 could look at a set of circumstances and preclude
- everything apart from the option that they decide. That
- 14 can happen in a matter of seconds. But they have got to
- explain themselves, and justify their actions.
- 16 Q. That justification has to be provided for that use of
- force to be deemed legal?
- 18 A. Yes, well, I -- I am not sure I would describe it as
- 19 legal, but it's a requirement within Article 2 and
- 20 within Article 3. If they overstep the mark, that could
- 21 cross into criminality, in which case we would be taking
- the matter to Crown.
- Q. In terms of the completion of the form, is it right to
- say that there's actually more than one reason why those
- forms should be completed? One is formal notification

1 in terms of the legislation? 2 Α. Yes. 3 There has been use of an item, a spray, which is Q. 4 classified as a firearm? 5 Α. Yes. And so there has to be that notification to PIRC? 6 Q. 7 Α. Yes. Q. And we have heard it is done through officer safety 8 9 training and an email address that then comes to PIRC 10 within 24 hours, I think? 11 Α. Normally. 12 Q. Normally. The other element in terms of completing the 13 form is to justify why that use of force was adopted, 14 why that spray was discharged? 15 Α. That's correct. So in terms of the notification to Mr Harrower on 3 May, 16 Q. 17 although there may have been notification or he was 18 advised spray had been discharged, what about the 19 justification part, if the forms were not completed? 20 Yes, well I think I would split that into two areas, so Α. 21 legislative-wise Police Scotland are required to notify 22 us of the discharge of CS/PAVA. Then you you've got second element which is the officers themselves must 23 24 justify why they considered it necessary, and we then

look at necessity, proportionality etc. So you've got

- 1 the legal requirements on Police Scotland, moving down
- 2 below that level is the officer then must justify that.
- Q. So it's not for Police Scotland to create
- a justification, it's for the individual officer and
- 5 it's their responsibility --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- to provide justification?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Regardless of any notification requirements under the
- 10 legislation?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Thank you. Is that part of what you said before
- the break, that it could be a line manager or
- 14 a supervisor who completes the form notifying PIRC of
- 15 the discharge?
- 16 A. Yes. Equally, sometimes the supervisor may obtain the
- 17 account from the officers, and then commit that account
- on to the form, but he should have spoken to the officer
- 19 and obtained the officer's thought processes as to why
- 20 he considered the use of CS PAVA was necessary.
- 21 Q. Necessary, reasonable and proportionate?
- 22 A. Yes. The vast majority of the officers themselves
- 23 complete the forms, but occasionally you will get
- 24 a supervisor or somebody else completing it. That is
- 25 rare, but it can happen.

reason?

- Q. We heard that there can be situations where the officer
  is injured or goes off duty immediately afterwards and
  isn't in a position to complete the form for some health
- 5 A. Yes.

4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. In that case a supervisor can carry out the process themselves?
- 8 A. Yes, that is largely the circumstances I am describing.
- 9 Q. We heard evidence from Mr Little that these forms can be
  10 gathered in by PIRC and they are not just left in
  11 a filing cabinet somewhere but actually there is
  12 a process that they go through in relation to PIRC in
  13 terms of assessing the justification that is provided;
  14 is that correct?
  - A. Yes, it applies to all police-referred matters to PIRC, they undergo that assessment process. There is a huge number of CS/PAVA referrals to us, they greatly outweigh any other type of referral, but it does go through an assessment process. The more complex the incident, the greater the assessment. Sometimes you might decide to immediately -- without probing the incident any further, as soon as the referral comes in you think: no, this is quite a serious situation, we're moving straight to investigation without undertaking a detailed assessment for -- well, what could be described as more

- minor matters. So if it is simply they have discharged

  CS/PAVA to bring the person under control, they've

  justified that in the form, you complete that

  assessment, and you decide not to investigate. So there

  is a whole range of considerations when you are

  undertaking assessment.
- Q. Is that assessment essentially a preliminary view by

  PIRC in regard to whether it appears obviously

  a reasonable approach or there may be issues that

  require investigation?
- Yes. And we have also got to bear in mind that PIRC are 11 Α. 12 an oversight body of Police Scotland so we will -- even 13 though we might consider that the actions were 14 proportionate, reasonable, necessary, we will examine 15 a random sample of these and investigate them to ensure that Police Scotland are and their officers are acting 16 17 in accordance with policy and procedure. Because 18 otherwise, if we don't investigate some of these, they 19 are not necessarily performing the oversight function that we are set up to do. 20
  - Q. So PIRC do not simply just take the forms at face value, they occasionally dig below the surface?
- A. Yes. If we pick up something within a form, when doing
  the assessment, thinking: hmm, this doesn't sound quite
  right, we would move it to an investigation, but equally

21

- 1 we will randomly dip sample some of these and move them
- 2 to investigation, just to make sure that Police Scotland
- 3 are ticking the right boxes for want of a better
- 4 expression.
- 5 Q. Thank you. I was also going to ask you about
- an incident which had taken place on 18 October 2014
- 7 in Victoria Hospital, where we understand there was
- 8 a discharge of CS spray in the Accident and Emergency
- 9 department and we heard some evidence about this from
- 10 Mr Little.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. He said there was a PIRC investigation into that
- discharge.
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And a report had been prepared and some recommendations
- 16 were made. Do you have -- do you know about that
- investigation?
- 18 A. Yes. I think Mr Little, he was the lead investigator
- 19 for that. I, as his supervisor, then quality controlled
- 20 the report so I was aware of the findings and
- 21 recommendations.
- Q. Do you remember what the recommendations were roughly in
- relation to that?
- 24 A. It was primarily surrounding record-keeping within
- 25 Fife Division of Police Scotland. The records were

1 chaotic for want of a better term, CS/PAVA wasn't regularly getting weighed so you couldn't tell whether 2 3 anybody had used it, how much they had used, etc. It 4 was chaotic, and the recommendations were primarily, for 5 want of a better expression: you need to get your house in order here, you need, you know, proper records, 6 7 proper control. When were Police Scotland advised about those 8 Q. 9 recommendations; do you remember? 10 Α. I don't remember. When we issue findings and recommendations to Police Scotland we usually ask that 11 12 they report to PIRC within three months of receiving the 13 report with the findings and recommendations, as to what 14 steps they have taken to implement them. 15 Now, I can't remember when we issued the report in 16 relation to the Victoria Hospital. What I do know is 17 that it was I think potentially the November following 18 the death of Mr Bayoh that Police Scotland came back to 19 PIRC to say how they had implemented the recommendations 20 from the Victoria Hospital incident, so several months 21 after the event. If the event, if you take it from me it 22 Q. was October 2014, that would be just over a year after 23 the event? 24 Yes. 25 Α.

- 1 Q. Mr Little talked about this and he couldn't recall but
- 2 thought that perhaps the three-month period would have
- 3 gone beyond May 2015. Do you have any recollection of
- 4 that?
- 5 A. No, I don't.
- Q. No. Thank you. We were on the document from June 2014,
- 7 and that was PIRC 04438. I will just complete going
- 8 through this at the moment. I won't go into the detail
- 9 at this stage. Do we see on page 2 that in relation to
- investigative processes, there's mention there of PIRC
- investigation at the scene. There is comment
- 12 geographical location and how quickly PIRC can arrive at
- 13 a scene?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. There is reference here to the PIRC scene manager, and
- 16 that:
- "A trained and experienced PIRC scene manager will
- 18 be appointed."
- 19 Did you have PIRC trained and experienced scene
- 20 managers in place in May 2015?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Then it talks about the initial actions to consider the
- 23 circumstances, and the consultation to be had. And the
- 24 PIRC senior investigator will produce a scene
- 25 investigation strategy which they will deliver on behalf

of the senior investigator? 1 2 Α. Yes. 3 "The strategy will ensure the locus is Q. photographed/video recorded capturing all evidence 4 5 in situ and where appropriate aerial and '360 degree' photography should be utilised." 6 7 Yes. Α. And: 8 Q. 9 "Any scene entry log already in place by Police Scotland should be discontinued and held as 10 a production. A PIRC scene entry log should be raised 11 12 and maintained throughout duration of the scene investigation~..." 13 14 Yes. Α. 15 Then if we move on to the next page, page 3. There's Q. talk of cordons, there will be a uniform police presence 16 17 to ensure the security of the outer cordon? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Although we have heard evidence about the importance of Q. 20 independence, we have heard that in terms of scenes 21 often PIRC will have to rely on the support of Police Scotland officers, who may be uniformed 22 officers --23 24 Α. Yes. Q. -- to secure and preserve the integrity of a scene. 25

25

1 that correct? 2 That is correct. I think looking at it logically it's Α. 3 the sight of a uniformed police officer saying to 4 somebody: sorry, this is taped off, as a member of the 5 public you cannot get in here. And that is difficult for PIRC investigators to do, we don't wear uniforms or 6 7 whatever, a lot of times members of the public are completely unaware of who we are and what our functions 8 9 are. And therefore that is primarily why you will use 10 uniformed police officers on the cordon. And you have seen it on television, we have all seen it on 11 12 television, you know, the blue and white tape things, 13 cordoned off. 14 First of all, would you have the resources to allocate Q. 15 someone that task of ensuring nobody gets into the scene? 16 No. 17 Α. 18 Q. Do you have any concerns about how this appears to the 19 public when PIRC are involved in what should be 20 an entirely independent investigation? 21 Α. I think we have to look at the practicalities, which is 22 PIRC are a very small organisation, we are not funded or staffed to undertake a lot of these scenes. And I fully 23 appreciate the -- what you would say is the -- how it 24

looks. The optics, I meant to say, sorry. I was trying

to remember the word there. The optics. I fully 1 understand the optics but it is the practicalities that 2 3 kick in, in these events. 4 Q. Then it says: 5 "The PIRC scene manager should liaise with the Police Scotland scene manager and establish what 6 7 Specialist Forensic Services have been requested by Police Scotland prior to PIRC arrival~..." 8 9 Again, is this what you were talking about earlier, 10 identifying what specialist resources may be required that may include forensic specialists? 11 12 A. Yes, invariably if you are going to photograph an incident scene, that will be the Scottish Police 13 Authority, SPA Identification Bureau. 14 15 Q. Thank you. LORD BRACADALE: Sorry to interrupt, I wonder if somebody 16 17 could just move the microphone down a bit. I think it is not quite picking you up. Try that now. 18 My Lord, I think I was trying avoid punching it. 19 20 LORD BRACADALE: I appreciate that but I think it is 21 probably more important that we hear you rather than --22 we can live with the difficulty with the microphone. Thank you. 23 24 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. It says there: 25

1 "... PIRC will have primacy in relation to the investigation into the police shooting/discharge 2 3 [discharge of spray], Police Scotland may have a duty in 4 relation to the scene in terms of another criminal 5 offence, ie the person shot ... is concerned in firearms offences or has committed another crime at the scene." 6 7 I think that is what you touched on before the break where you talked about a scenario where in relation to 8 the Glasgow shooting the person had allegedly -- or had 9 10 stabbed five individuals prior to the police using force --11 12 Α. Yes. Q. -- and shooting that person. I think as I understand 13 14 your evidence you said PIRC investigate the use of force 15 by the officers, but the five stabbings would remain within the purview of the police? 16 Yes. But certainly when we are reporting the incident 17 Α. to Crown, you are trying to put context around why did 18 the police use lethal force, so while the police are 19 20 investigating the initial incidents, the five stabbings, 21 we have obtained details from Police Scotland of those 22 incidents because it is like a continuous sequence of events, you can't just start at this point which is: why 23 did you shoot him? Well, we shot him because ... the 24 sequence of events that occurred before that. So there 25

1		is an exchange of information frequently between
2		between Police Scotland and PIRC. Sometimes in
3		relation to that incident, I think we figured out some
4		of the attacks were targeted attacks but Police Scotland
5		were not aware of that, so it's the exchange of
6		information because it is a continuous sequence of
7		events, and for both reporting separately to Crown but
8		drawing a line and saying: well, that is us, that is
9		Police Scotland. It is then more difficult to
10		understand the totality of what has occurred so that is
11		why there is an information exchange.
12	Q.	So you are avoiding a sort of artificial separation of
13		events when they are linked?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	Thank you. Then at the bottom of the page we see:
16		"PIRC productions officer/s should seize and
17		accurately record and label all productions from the
18		scene as directed by the scene manager.
19		"A PIRC investigator performing the role of scribe
20		will shadow the [senior investigator] and record all
21		requests/instructions made by the~
22		[senior investigator], capturing the time and date,
23		details of person requested/instructed and any
24		reply/comment made in response to the
25		request/instruction."

- 1 Α. Yes. We have heard evidence from Mr Little that in his role 2 Q. 3 as lead investigator he may be very busy, there is a lot 4 happening, but the scribe will note down what is 5 happening as it takes place. Is that the role? Yes. That is the ideal situation, which is you take 6 Α. 7 somebody with you. If you are the lead investigator you have all sort of considerations, you are talking to 8 9 a lot of different people, and therefore you want 10 somebody with you who is going to take notes. That is the ideal scenario, frequently it does occur, 11 12 occasionally it might not occur. I have been to 13 an incident when I was the first person there and it 14 took two or three hours for the rest of my staff to 15 arrive, so you do your best. In that situation why were you the first person to 16 Q. 17 arrive and the team didn't arrive for two or three hours? 18
- A. What had happened was I had finished and was on the
  motorway passing Glasgow Airport when I got phone call
  saying we have just shot somebody in Inverness. Now, we
  work 8 to 4 therefore all the staff had went home, so
  I am phoning Crown, Crown are saying -- in this instance
  I said to Crown: do you want to instruct? They
  said: no, we don't. Therefore I will take it as

- 1 a police referral, phoning the office and saying: right, get the staff back into the office, because they are all 2 3 headed home and what I did was simply turned round and 4 drove straight up to Inverness. Of course they have got 5 to get back into the office, get all their kit, notebooks, all that sort of stuff load up the car and 6 7 then drive to Inverness. So effectively I was on the road already, whereas they would have to come back in, 8 so that is why I would arrive two or three hours before 9 10 them. Did you not feel the need to go back to the office and 11 Q. 12 brief staff or pick up kit?
- 13 It was the practicalities, because those who are Α. 14 familiar with Glasgow, the Kingston Bridge during the 15 rush hour is, for want of a better expression, a nightmare, therefore I headed over the 16 17 Erskine Bridge and cut across country because otherwise 18 it might have taken me 90 minutes to get back to the 19 office adding additional delays. So again, it was just the practicalities. 20
  - Q. So on that occasion you arrived first, on your own?
- 22 A. Yes.

- 23 Q. There was no scribe, there was no team with you?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. But you were able to go to the scene and take charge at

they arrived.

- 1 that point?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. That was a decision that you made based on
- 4 practicalities as well as anything else?
- 5 A. Yes.

- Q. Did that hinder your team, the fact that you had not met them at the office and given them a briefing in advance?
- No, obviously I have hands-free in the car so I could 8 Α. 9 phone and describe the set of circumstances that was 10 getting relayed to me. Because I was getting phone calls from various people within Police Scotland, 11 12 including the appointed post-incident manager and 13 I would then relay that information to the team that 14 were coming out so that they were briefed on the 15 circumstances so they could hit the ground running as
- Q. Did you find that telephone communication with your team adequate for the purpose?
- A. Yes. There is always -- as they arrive -- it depends on the last communication you had with them. If the last communication you had had with them for example was an hour before and you had been tied up doing things, you would want to update them as to what has happened within the last hour and then get them assigned to their duties.

1	Q.	Right. Then looking at:
2		"PIRC investigation at the (PIM) suite."
3		Post-incident management suite. Is this an example
4		of what you were saying earlier about the terms being
5		interchangeable?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	"The PIRC senior investigator attending at the scene
8		will deploy a post-incident management aware member
9		of PIRC staff to the Police Scotland post-incident
10		management suite."
11		Was this also what you were talking about earlier,
12		where someone who has maybe had awareness training will
13		be appointed although they may not be a post-incident
14		manager, a qualified PIM?
15	Α.	Yes. Because I think we need to remember that PIP or
16		PIM is a police process, it has a dual purpose. There
17		is an investigative element of it, and there is also the
18		welfare element of it. So it's very much a police
19		process, so certainly we need to understand from our
20		perspective the four stages within that process.
21		Equally, there are certain functions that we will
22		want to oversee, so if firearms are discharged we will
23		want to oversee and video record what is called the
24		count back, so unload your weapon, drop your weapon or
25		drop the magazine out of the weapon, count how many

bullets are in, how many bullets did you start with, how
many bullets are left in it, does that equate with the
number of shots fired.

So there is quite a lot within that to oversee, so it is not just the four stages. Equally, you might be seizing clothing etc. Now, it is not necessarily what you think because you are not seizing a firearms officer's clothing for firearms deposit residue because their clothing has that on it all day, every day. But sometimes it can be to confirm the actions of the officers, so police firearms officers are trained that if they shoot somebody they will immediately go forward and render first aid. So there might be a transference of blood and they might tell you: yes, I went forward and I gave first aid. You examine the clothing, there is blood on the clothing, that matches their account and therefore supports their account of events.

So there is quite a lot of complexities within these and considerations. Not all of them apply to every set of circumstance, it just depends -- each one is unique.

Q. The post-incident manager or post-incident management aware investigator will also be ascribed a scribe:

"Ideally a PIRC investigator scribe will shadow and record all requests/instructions, timed and dated made by the PIRC PIM aware investigator."

1	Α.	Yes, depending on the nature of incident there is
2		usually two PIRC staff go, somebody that is PIM aware
3		and somebody to support them. In large-scale incidents
4		we can be deploying four, five, six, staff to
5		an individual PIP suite, we have had incidents where
6		there has been three different PIP suites dotted across
7		the country, and we are sending staff to each of them to
8		oversee that. So it can quickly eat up resources. But
9		we do need to go and we do need to go and we do need
LO		to oversee it and at least two staff go to each one. Ir
11		more complex incidents, I think I touched on it before
12		the break, we have had an incident with 53 key police
L3		witnesses, so that is quite a large amount of people to
L 4		manage, with different post-incident suites.
L5	Q.	It says:
16		"A PIRC scene manager/production officer(s) will
L7		also attend at the PIM suite and seize any
L8		firearms/production identified as relevant."
L9		And then it identifies the six PIM suites that are
20		available around the country.
21	Α.	There is dedicated PIM suites. These are the dedicated
22		PIM suites, but a PIM suite can be held in any police
23		office where it's feasible. So, for example, something
24		happens in Thurso, you are not removing officers to

Inverness, you know, because it is three hours

precludes that.

- northwards. So the PIM suite, if the incident happened in Thurso, the PIM suite might be in Thurso. We have had a death in custody in Elgin, the PIM suite was held in Elgin. Again, ideally you are going to a dedicated PIM suite but the geography of Scotland sometimes
- Q. I think we have heard that the officers were gathered in Kirkcaldy Police Office after Mr Bayoh died?
- 9 A. Yes.

- 10 Q. And that was in the canteen area?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Is that the type of larger space that can be used to accommodate a PIM suite?
- Yes. Usually it is one large room. The dedicated PIM 14 Α. 15 suites have several rooms because also you need office accommodation for the post-incident manager from 16 17 Police Scotland and their staff. If we turn up we are 18 going to want office accommodation as well. So the room 19 itself might be where the principal officers are sat, 20 but we will need to use additional offices just to 21 manage whatever we are doing.
- Q. Thank you. Then if we look at the final page it talks
  about conferring, officers not conferring with each
  other, which you have already spoken about, it's on the
  last page. If there is a need to confer:

"... in order to ensure transparency and maintain 1 2 public confidence, this must be documented including 3 time, date, place, issues discussed, by whom and the 4 reason(s)." 5 And: "The Police Scotland PIM manager should have 6 7 reminded the officers involved in relation to conferring." 8 9 Then there is a section at the bottom called, "Minimum deployment of PIRC personnel". It is split 10 into scene and PIM suite. Do you see that? 11 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. At "Scene" it says: 14 "Senior investigating officer. 15 "Scribe. 16 "Scene manager. "2 production officers." 17 That would be five individuals? 18 That is the ideal. Equally, if you have got multiple 19 Α. 20 scenes, you know, you are going to have multiple 21 deployments. So there could be more than that but that says minimum 22 Q. deployment in relation to the scene? 23 Yes, when we are talking scene here we are talking about 24 Α. the general location, not necessarily to the exact scene 25

1 of the incident. Although the scene managers and production officers might be going directly there, the 2 3 PIRC lead investigator might be going to the police 4 office to find out what has happened. 5 So if we have heard that there were officers in Q. 6 Kirkcaldy Police Office, and PIRC investigators went 7 there --8 Α. Yes. 9 -- but there was also a scene at Hayfield Road --Q. 10 Α. Yes. -- that wouldn't necessarily require this minimum number 11 Q. 12 of officers to be at both locations? 13 No, I think Garry Sinclair was the person deployed to Α. 14 Hayfield Road as the PIRC scene manager. And 15 John Ferguson, who sadly is no longer with us, was deployed to Victoria Hospital. 16 The senior investigating officer, is that effectively 17 Q. 18 a lead investigator? 19 Yes. The terminology changes. It is like -- you've got Α. 20 a lead investigator, you've got a senior investigating 21 officer you've got an initial investigating officer. 22 Broadly they are all the same -- the same person but 23 just sometimes the nomenclature slightly changes. But 24 for PIRC it is either a lead investigator or a senior investigator, and it's not always the person 25

- 1 with the title of senior investigator, they are the
- 2 senior investigator for that investigation.
- 3 Q. So you may be within PIRC's hierarchy
- 4 a senior investigator, you may be
- 5 a deputy senior investigator, or simply an investigator,
- 6 but you may be appointed as a lead investigator in
- 7 relation to an incident?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Thank you. Then the second element there of minimum
- 10 deployment relates to the PIM suite. We have heard from
- 11 a PIM, a PIM manager, Conrad Trickett --
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. -- about events in May of 2015, and he said that if you
- are a suspect, you are removed from PIP?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. Was that correct?
- 17 A. That is correct.
- Q. So PIP or PIM or a PIM suite, that would contain people
- who were witnesses?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Officers who may have witnessed an event?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. But not suspects?
- 24 A. Certainly not.
- 25 Q. And the minimum deployment for that area would be

a PIM-aware investigator, a scribe, a scene manager and a productions officer, so that is four individual roles?

A. That is the ideal. There have been incidents where you don't need four people, you only require two people, so for example all incidents are managed by control rooms, we have heard about area control rooms within the police. But the staff within the area control room that managed the incident, they could be seen as key police witnesses.

Now, there is no need for forensic examination on anything like that, you will pick up the Airwaves radio traffic later, so you might only need to send two people to the control room where that PIP is being held, and that is frequently why you have multiple PIPs because you have the control room controlling the incident, and I think for Mr Bayoh's death the incident was controlled at Bilston Glen, which is in Edinburgh, whereas you have the incident in Kirkcaldy, so you might have two separate PIP suites.

There have been times when we have had three separate PIP suites: one for the control room, one for the location and then there has been actions by other officers at a distance from it, therefore there has been three post-incident processes run.

Q. If you only have one PIM suite and one scene, would you

- 1 agree that this is the minimum deployment --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- in relation to PIRC personnel?
- 4 A. Yes, and that is usually what we do. We will evaluate
- 5 it so if there has been a discharge of firearms we will
- 6 send four to that PIP suite. But equally, that incident
- is being controlled by the control room, we will send
- 8 two additional staff to that location.
- 9 Q. That is if there are two PIM suites?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. So that -- looking just that the page of minimum
- deployment, that would be a total of nine roles, nine
- 13 PIRC personnel?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And that would be the minimum deployment that would
- normally be sent?
- 17 A. That is the ideal.
- 18 Q. Thank you. We have heard from Mr Harrower and we have
- 19 heard from Mr Little that Mr Harrower was lead
- 20 investigator on 3 May 2015?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Mr Little took over on 4 May?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And then that you became involved on Tuesday, 5 May.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. So from your statement I understand you arrived on duty
- 2 at 8 o'clock on 5 May 2015 and that is when you learned
- 3 about the incident?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. You hadn't been personally involved in the events on the
- 6 3rd or the 4th?
- 7 A. No. So the 3rd was the Sunday, the 4th was the Monday
- 8 but that was the May day public holiday so I was off
- 9 that day.
- 10 Q. When did you first hear about the death of Mr Bayoh; was
- it on arrival on 5 May?
- 12 A. Yes. I think I had actually been away with my wife on
- the 4th so I didn't pick up on it until I went into my
- work on the 5th.
- 15 Q. The 5th was the Tuesday?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. We have heard that at that time Mr Harrower and
- 18 Mr Little were deputy senior investigators in PIRC --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- but appointed as lead investigators. We have heard
- 21 that at that time you were a senior investigator?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. And you came in on the Tuesday?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. I would just like to ask you a little bit about your

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- role on the Tuesday, because before Mr Little came in we understood you were appointed lead investigator on the Tuesday. But Mr Little said that initially he remained in that role, you came in with oversight but it then evolved and you were effectively the lead and he was your deputy. I would like to hear your explanation of your role on the Tuesday.
- I think initially -- so on the Monday Billy was 8 Α. 9 appointed as lead investigator. I came in on the 10 Tuesday and was told: right, provide oversight and assistance to Billy. As the complexities very 11 12 rapidly developed, it was then decided, right, I am now the senior investigator, and Billy is my deputy. When 13 precisely that happened, I can't say now but it did 14 15 happen fairly rapidly.
  - Q. Mr Little wasn't able to remember a precise moment in time when you became the lead and he took the role of your deputy. When you say "fairly rapidly" can you help the Chair understand when that role evolved that you were the lead?
    - A. I think it was shortly after the 5th. It didn't happen on the 5th because I think you will see from my policy log that at some point I have recorded Mr Little as the lead investigator with me as the back-up. So it would have been after the 5th because otherwise I wouldn't

have recorded that on paper. So it was probably from -in fact it was -- I am quite certain it was the 6th, and the reason why I say that is because I then decided to go through to Fife to meet -- along with Billy to meet with DCI Keith Hardie to do with approaching the nine principal officers. So I am fairly certain it was the 6th, that is why I say it quite rapidly evolved into that.

- Q. And in terms of the practicalities of that role which you had, did you change your approach from having oversight on the 5th, to when you became lead investigator, and if so can you explain how you did that?
- A. No, most of the 5th was taken up in understanding exactly what had happened, getting the PIRC incident room up and running, allocating roles and responsibilities. Some of those had already occurred on the 3rd and the 4th, but getting an understanding of exactly what had happened. And there is also quite a lot of information coming in during that sort of period, some of it conflicting, some it erroneous, so you are trying to understand exactly the nature of the incident.

So for me on day one you are getting briefings from staff, you are reading briefing papers -- I know you

have examined Keith's briefing paper -- and you are
getting a good understanding, you are also -- myself and
Billy are talking all the time, because it is still is
very early doors in the investigation. And we are just
agreeing priorities.

Really when you get an Inquiry of this magnitude, really the lead investigator, the senior investigator, takes responsibility for policies and strategies, with the deputy then converting them into practical actions for staff then to go out and undertake that, to complete the sort of -- what your policies and strategies are. But you work seamlessly because you are talking all the time, and equally if one of you goes off on holiday for a week the other has to be able to take over. You don't leave a gap.

So there is a really close relationship between the senior investigator and their deputy, because that needs to occur. And that occurs whether it's within PIRC, it occurs within the police, it occurs within other agencies.

Q. I would like -- you have mentioned the policy and there was a policy log, I would like to come on to that in a moment. But before I do so, can I ask you some questions focused towards the independence of the enquiry. I think in your statement you said that you

1 knew some of the officers who were involved in the 2 investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. Police officers from Police Scotland? 5 Α. Yes. And I would like to ask you particularly about those. 6 Q. 7 You have said that you knew Pat Campbell, we have heard he was the SIO? 8 9 Yes. Α. 10 Q. And you knew ACC Nicolson --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- who was the Gold Commander? 13 Yes. Α. 14 You have said in your statement you had no relationship Q. 15 with them in May 2015 but I wonder if you could just explain in a little more detail how you knew them and 16 17 what your relationship had been before? Yes. So starting with Pat Campbell, I worked in 18 Α. Intelligence at force headquarters, Pat Campbell worked 19 20 in CID Operations. He was a detective superintendent in 21 CID Intelligence, Special Operations. He was 22 a detective sergeant at headquarters. So I knew that he worked at headquarters, I would occasionally pass him in 23 24 the corridor but I never worked alongside him. And in 25 respect of the Bayoh enquiry I had no contact with him

1 throughout the duration of the Bayoh investigation. No 2 contact at all. 3 Moving on to Mr Nicolson, when I was 4 detective superintendent down in Ayrshire division 5 Mr Nicolson was my line manager, so he was the Detective Chief Superintendent, and he line managed the 6 7 detective superintendents in each of the geographical divisions. So I certainly knew him. But when I moved 8 9 on to the intelligence side I then had a different line 10 manager. Now, again I had no contact with Mr Nicolson 11 12 throughout the duration of the Bayoh enquiry, so I did 13 not see those as potential conflicts. I knew of them, 14 I explained my relationship to them, but I didn't see 15 any conflict there. Can I ask you a little more about your contact or 16 Q. relationship with ACC Nicolson. 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. You said he was your line manager. How many other 20 detective superintendents did he line manage at that 21 time? 22 At that time there was ... I think there was 12 Α. territorial divisions within Strathclyde and each had 23 a detective superintendent in charge of the CID for that 24 division. It was slightly unique insofar as the 25

1 detective superintendents in the division didn't answer to the division or the divisional command, they answered 2 3 to the Detective Chief Superintendent CID Operations, 4 who was Mr Nicolson. So he was managing them. There 5 was also two or three specialist 6 detective superintendents in charge of specialist areas, 7 so for example at one point in time the detective superintendent in charge of the Fraud Squad, 8 9 so they would be managed within CID Operations, and 10 maybe answerable to the detective chief superintendent 11 CID Operations. 12 Q. So when you were working in Ayr, how regularly did you 13 have discussions or meetings or contact with Nicolson? Usually you would have at the very least weekly contact. 14 Α. 15 If you were the on-call detective superintendent you would come out at the weekend, and you would then brief 16 17 Mr Nicolson on what had occurred over the weekend, 18 equally, you went down and you briefed the command team 19 as to serious incidents that occurred over the weekend, so you would have fairly regular contact with him. 20 21 How long were you in Ayr with this regular contact with Q. 22 ACC Nicolson? A. I think I was there for about six months, and then 23 I transferred up to Special Operations and that was --24 25 that moved me away from his line management.

Yes.

Α.

25

1 Q. I think we were looking at your career earlier. When 2 exactly did you move to Special Operations of 3 Special Branch; was this 2000 or was it a different 4 time? So I was DSI in Special Branch Special Operations, so 5 Α. that is covert investigations into terrorism or 6 7 organised crime and support to murder investigations. On return from Africa I was then appointed 8 9 detective superintendent in Ayrshire division. I spent 10 about six months there and then was transferred back to what you could call covert operations or covert 11 12 specialist operations, again examining terrorist 13 matters, organised crime, support to murder 14 investigations and I had various areas of business, some 15 of them quite sensitive areas of business. I think from your statement you told us that you had 16 Q. 17 returned from Sierra Leone in 2006 and it was after that you were promoted and moved to Ayr; is that correct? 18 19 Yes. Α. 20 And you spent six months with ACC Nicolson as your line Q. 21 manager? 22 Α. Yes. How long did you spend in Ayr; was that the six-month 23 Q. 24 period?

- 1 Q. So this was some time after 2006?
- 2 A. Probably during 2006.

11

12

13

- Q. Did you have any contact with ACC Nicolson after you moved and you were promoted?
- A. Yes, you would see him on a regular basis, not so much to discuss business because we were in two very different business areas, I worked on the secret covert side of policing, dealing with quite sensitive matters.

  But I would see him on a regular basis because it was headquarters and his office was probably -- it was at
  - Q. As well as seeing him in the building, did you have actual contact with him during that period?

the other end of the corridor from where my office was.

- A. Occasionally because if the operational arm of CID

  required assistance in respect of targeting organised

  crime groups or murder eenquiries -- and we are now

  dealing with highly sensitive matters, so if they

  required assistance, they would approach me for such

  assistance.
- Q. But he no longer had line management responsibility towards you?
- A. No, and I was also the authorising officer at one time

  for a lot of the covert activity under -- it was RIP and

  RIPS, it is now the Investigatory Powers Act. Although

  the highly sensitive material was required to go to the

1 Chief Constable, I then acted as effectively the scribe for the Chief Constable and it then went to the 2 Surveillance Commissioners, now the Interception of 3 4 Communications Commissioner, for authorisation. 5 So therefore Mr Nicolson or one of the other 6 detective superintendents might say: look, we're hitting 7 a brick wall with this investigation, we need covert and sensitive assets deployed, so they would seek such 8 assistance, and if it was -- if you consider it 9 10 necessary and proportionate, you would facilitate that. When did your contact with ACC Nicolson come to an end? 11 Q. 12 (Pause). When did your contact with ACC Nicolson come 13 to an end? Probably when I retired from the police. Because we 14 Α. 15 worked in the same building, we worked in the same 16 corridor, although they are on one side of the building, 17 we are on the other side of the building. But you would 18 you see him -- you would pass him on a regular basis. So was that about 2012? 19 Q. Probably. 20 Α. 21 So by 2015 -- between 2012 and 2015 had you had any Q. 22 contact with ACC Nicolson at all? Not that I recall, I don't think so. 23 Α. 24 Q. Did you -- we have heard evidence there was a process, a code of conduct in PIRC, and a process where if you 25

- were concerned about any possible conflict you could
- 2 declare a knowledge of someone or awareness or
- 3 a familiarity or a relationship.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Did you feel in 2015 that you should declare your prior
- 6 knowledge and awareness and contact with ACC Nicolson or
- 7 not?
- 8 A. No, because I had no contact with Mr Nicolson during the
- 9 Bayoh enquiry, therefore I didn't consider there was
- 10 a conflict.
- 11 Q. Thank you. I would like to move on and look at your log
- 12 that you have already mentioned.
- 13 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 14 Q. Can we look at a typed version first. The policy log
- 15 PIRC 04153. We've looked at this the document with
- Mr Little in evidence, and it is a policy log which is,
- as I understand it, a typed version of a handwritten log
- that you would have prepared.
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. So Mr Little said you were the author of the policy log;
- is that right?
- 22 A. That is correct.
- Q. And you commenced that on 5 May 2015.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. This is a typed version of it. I am actually going to

1 go through the detailed handwritten version with you 2 today but we can see from this document on the face of it the incident is 3 May, the senior investigating 3 4 officer is named as DSI William Little, who is the 5 deputy senior investigator. The deputy investigating officer is given as you, John McSporran, who is the 6 7 senior investigator. I think that is what we touched on a short while ago, 8 Α. 9 that that sort of flipped on the Tuesday. Sorry, on the 10 Wednesday, which would be the 6th. So when I wrote -initially committed this to paper, the front page is 11 12 these roles and responsibilities, but that quickly 13 flipped on the next day. So on Tuesday 5th you are listed as the deputy --14 Q. 15 Α. Yes. -- to Mr Little, who is the lead investigator. The 16 Q. following day that flipped, and you became -- you 17 essentially took the lead --18 19 Yes. Α. -- from 6th May? You also mentioned earlier that you 20 Q. 21 were appointed to take oversight. I am interested in

25 A. I think it is just an anomaly because I had to -- I had

that, please?

this -- a relationship between someone who is listed as

both the deputy who also has oversight. Can you explain

22

23

24

11

25

- 1 to record somewhere that I was involved, and there is no mechanism -- because it is quite prescriptive describing 2 3 the roles here there is no role for oversight or 4 overseer, therefore the best way I thought I could 5 record that I was involved was by putting myself down as 6 deputy. That was on the 5th. And it was a simple 7 matter of to a certain extent transparency, to show that I was involved. 8 Q. This role of having oversight, regardless of what is on 9 10 that page, what did that role involve? Did you
  - understand the nature of that role?
- 12 Α. I think it was to support and assist Billy Little. But 13 as I say, that quickly evolved the next day, and 14 we don't really have anybody since then appointed as 15 overseer. You do have -- in my role as head of investigations for PIRC you will have oversight of all 16 17 the ongoing investigations and the reports, but that 18 doesn't make you the overseer in respect of any of the 19 specific investigations. So I think it was more 20 an anomaly in respect of this one, where it was 21 like: John, you have oversight, you help Billy. And 22 come my day two, which was the 6th that flipped so: John, you're now the lead investigator, Billy you're 23 24 the deputy.
  - Q. Who was it that ultimately took that decision to make

1 you lead?

- 2 A. I think it was Mr Mitchell.
- From perhaps a slightly different perspective from 3 Q. 4 someone outside PIRC, someone with the role of having 5 oversight may be viewed as someone who is sitting above the lead investigator, and perhaps checking things are 6 7 done properly or where things are being missed or not being done properly they could perhaps direct 8 9 a different direction in relation to investigation; is 10 that any part of having oversight?
- I would say yes, considering what you are saying just 11 Α. 12 now. But equally, when you are the senior investigating 13 officer you are checking the statements, checking who is 14 doing what, all that sort of stuff. So there's a degree 15 of oversight there of the investigation, you are the senior investigating officer, you are overseeing that 16 17 investigation, you are directing, you are creating policies, strategies, you are interacting with the 18 19 deputy senior investigator, who is translating a lot of 20 that into actions. Staff go out, they complete the action, take a statement, get productions, get 21 22 documents, whatever, that is brought in, it gets recorded within the investigation, and you are examining 23 that and you are reading -- reading a lot of -- a lot of 24 25 things, so that you are as aware as possible of

- 1 everything that is going on. 2 Equally, you can get information overload so 3 sometimes the best way to gain an understanding is just 4 to have staff brief you or you have a daily briefing 5 where staff impart to you and the deputy the relevant and salient points from their actions the day before. 6 7 Rather than going chapter and verse as to what has occurred, it's like: tell me the important stuff I need 8 9 to know here, I will catch up on the reading when I get 10 the opportunity. So regardless of your PIRC title or what is said here, 11 Q. 12 am I correct in saying that you had a contribution to 13 make to this investigation and you had influence over 14 the direction of the investigation? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Thank you. Let's look at -- just the other names Q. 17 mentioned, we've heard that -- who is listed as office 18 manager, Ian MacIntyre, we were told he was one of three staff involved in the major incident room --19 20 Α. Yes. 21 -- if I can put it that way, and productions officer we Q. 22 have heard -- you have mentioned Garry Sinclair, who was
- Q. He was also involved in other matters as well.

23

24

Α.

Yes.

allocated the role of scene manager for Hayfield Road?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Then other relevant staff included yourself,
- John Ferguson, who was also a qualified scene manager.
- 4 Family liaison involved Alistair Lewis and John Clerkin?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. But we have heard from Mr Little that there were a large
- 7 number of members of PIRC, the PIRC team who were
- 8 involved, and in fact all bar one were actively involved
- 9 in this investigation?
- 10 A. Yes. I think we need to remember at that time we had
- 11 a total of 22 people. This was a large-scale
- investigation, it was very quickly becoming
- a large-scale investigation. Now, I have run murder
- 14 enquiries where I have had 50 or 60 staff and this was
- going to be a highly complex thing and we had to manage
- this with effectively 20 deployable staff. So staff are
- multitasking, some are doing crime scene management then
- as soon as they complete that they will move on to
- 19 another role. Quite apart from -- I think we have
- 20 touched on Garry Sinclair being crime scene manager
- 21 responsible for productions on day one, later on he
- 22 became the interview adviser when he was drawing up the
- 23 interview for the interview of the nine principal
- officers, so sometimes they are performing multiple
- 25 roles.

- Q. You have mentioned this in your Inquiry statement, but
  what were your views about the resources available to
  you in this investigation in relation to Mr Bayoh's
  death and the adequacy of those resources at that time?
- A. I don't want to stray into the political sphere.

  I don't consider that we were effectively funded or

  resourced to undertake the functions. I think probably

  Ms Frame might have more to say on that but I don't want

  to stray into the political sphere.
  - Q. From your experience -- looking back now and from your experience of dealing with murder investigations, deaths in custody, deaths following police contact, leaving aside political issues, but solely in relation to the numbers that you had available to conduct this investigation, do you feel you had adequate resources available to PIRC at that time?
    - A. At that time, no. Now, what I will add to that is that following the investigation of the death of Mr Bayoh and the investigation into the M9, the death crash on the M9, application was made saying: we are stretched here, we need additional funding, we need additional resourcing, and that was forthcoming. But I think it took the Bayoh investigation and the M9 crash, and our ever-increasing workload to demonstrate that we were under-resourced and under funded. Because

1 potentially -- this is a personal opinion now -- there should have been more of a scoping exercise undertaken 2 3 by Government to measure the scale of the task that PIRC 4 would have to undertake and that scoping exercise should 5 then have been used to identify how much funding and resourcing would be required. 6 7 I am not sure whether that occurred or to what level it occurred or what detail it occurred. 8 Thinking about the resourcing, we have heard there were 9 Q. 10 22 members of staff from top to bottom? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. That Mr Little on 4th came in and had all bar one working on this Inquiry. He still required the support 13 of Police Scotland? 14 15 Α. Yes. Particularly in relation to issues regarding 16 Q. house-to-house enquiries? 17 What I would say there is that, I think as we are aware 18 Α. and we have discussed, on Sunday, 3rd PIRC were simply 19 20 instructed to investigate the incident at Hayfield Road 21 and the aftermath of that. Whereas Police Scotland were 22 investigating all the events leading up to the incident at Hayfield Road. Sorry, I have lost my train of 23 thought. Can you repeat the question? 24 I was talking about resourcing and the adequacy of 25 Q.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

resourcing, and talking about some of the evidence we
have heard from Mr Little, talking about how he used all
but one of the PIRC resources and staff he had at his
disposal on the 4th when he came in. But, in addition,
he talked about still requiring to rely on support from
Police Scotland, and one of the matters I mentioned was
the house-to-house.

Yes, I think, because of the preceding incidents, Α. Police Scotland were doing that house-to-house enquiry. So, as we know, Mr Bayoh had been in the house of Mr Dick in the early hours of Sunday, 3rd. He had then left there and returned to his own house. There was an altercation outside with his friend, Mr Saeed. He then left that house and then walked along various roads until he arrived at Hayfield Road in Kirkcaldy. So we were doing Hayfield Road, the immediate nature of Hayfield Road, including house-to-house. Police Scotland were doing all the other house-to-house, because that is what they had to investigate. Now, that changed on the 5th where basically Crown said: just do everything, take over all aspects -- sorry, I am punching that again -- take over all aspects. At which point we told Police Scotland: stop the house-to-house, we are now taking over all aspects of the

house-to-house. But they had already done some of that

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- anyway. Fine. They had done it. We would examine what
  they had done. If we felt it necessary to go back and
  see somebody, then we would do that.
  - Q. So thinking about the resources that were available to PIRC that first week, approximately 21 members of staff were available. You have said you took the view that you were not adequately resourced. Can you help the Chair understand where you felt there was perhaps a shortfall or further resources would have benefitted PIRC at that time?
- Where you have limited resources, I think there is 11 Α. 12 a difference between an effective investigation and the 13 timeliness of the investigation. Because you can be 14 effective with limited resources, but it might take you 15 longer to get there and, therefore, the limitation on resources will delay the investigation and what can be 16 17 achieved within timescales. Part of the challenge, as we know, if we go back to the five principles, was 18 19 promptness. If you have limited resources, it delays 20 things, it adds to frustration, not just within the 21 organisation but it leads to frustration by, 22 for example, the family of the deceased, who consider that things aren't progressing as quickly as we would 23 like. You are doing the best with the resources you 24 25 have but, if those resources are limited, there is

4

5

6

7

- a limit. I know I have used the word "limited" and

  "limit" twice there, but there is a limit in what can be

  achieved within reasonable timescales.
  - Q. Looking back now at that early week, those early days, can you identify in your mind areas where you simply didn't have any more staff to do a task you would have liked to have been done?
- I think as the days went on staff began to multitask. 8 Α. 9 So we are sending out actions: right, let's complete the 10 house-to-house, let's get this -- you are prioritising what you are doing. Right, we want the house-to-house 11 12 completed as quickly as possible. So it was at that 13 point, and I think Billy Little touched upon it, I am 14 saying: I need additional resources here, I have ran out 15 of staff, and I went to the Commissioner, and she said: shut down the review section in PIRC, that is the other 16 17 side of our business, complaint handling reviews, get out and help the investigations team, let's complete the 18 house-to-house at the very least. So they assisted us 19 20 with that, to complete that aspect. Because that was 21 quite important. Because during the house-to-house you 22 were turning up witnesses who had seen -- or you were identifying witnesses. I use a lot of colloquialisms, 23 "turning up witnesses", but you were identifying 24 witnesses who had seen aspects of it and required 25

1 statements taken.

24

25

2 Equally it's a thing which frequently occurs -frequently occurs during murder investigations, there 3 4 are other things, you get the revisit of the scene 5 precisely one week later. So I organised the revisit to the scene one week later to see if -- because this 6 7 occurred 7.20 on the Sunday morning, so we would go there from about quarter to 7 on that morning through to 8 the back of 8 and see -- we would stop vehicles with the 9 10 assistance of the traffic department or roads policing in Police Scotland, stop vehicles, and that actually 11 12 threw up a couple of additional witnesses that had never 13 come forward in the first instance. So -- but because 14 you are doing that, as you are speaking to people, you 15 require staff to take them aside; who are they? What 16 did they see? Get statements from them. Sometimes arrange: well, you can't give a statement just now 17 18 because you are on your way to work, because the 19 hospital is fairly close by and there was a change over 20 of shift, so you are making arrangements to go back and 21 see them in the evening. There are all these things to 22 consider. 23

Q. When was it that you spoke to -- was it Ms Scullion, and she directed: let's shut down the complaint handling section and use those staff as well?

- 1 A. It was Ms Frame, who was the Commissioner.
- 2 Q. Sorry. Ms Frame, sorry.
- 3 A. I think that was within two or three days. Because
- I know I had those resources by the Sunday, which was
- 5 the week later, and our priority was completing the
- 6 house-to-house. So I knew I had those resources come
- 7 that weekend. Now, those staff did not work at
- 8 weekends, therefore I must have had them prior to the
- 9 weekend.
- 10 Q. So you come back to work on Tuesday, 5th?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. You've got additional resources at your disposal prior
- 13 to the weekend. Would that be by the Friday?
- 14 A. Potentially, yes.
- 15 Q. The 8th.
- 16 A. Yes. But I think what we need to remember is that none
- of those staff were trained investigators. They had an
- 18 entirely different function within PIRC. But equally
- 19 legislative-wise PIRC investigators have the powers of
- 20 a constable, other PIRC staff don't. So they didn't
- 21 have powers of a constable, because you are designated
- by the Commissioner and, if you ever look at a PIRC ID,
- on the back of it there is a statement that states the
- legislation and confers the powers of a constable on
- you. So investigators while doing the investigation on

- behalf of the Commissioner have the powers of
  a constable, other PIRC staff don't. So --
- Q. Did that then limit the roles or the tasks they could be allocated?
- 5 Yes, certainly. You wouldn't allocate them a task to Α. 6 undertake by themselves. Because usually you work in 7 pairs for the corroboration, what you would do is then split the investigators and actually give them a member 8 9 of the review staff to act as their corroborating 10 person, and that is how we did it. But we didn't individually allocate actions for them to go out and 11 12 complete. They were there to assist primarily from the 13 corroboration perspective.
- 14 Q. I see. Thank you. Can we turn now to the actual
  15 handwritten document. I am going to go through this and
  16 it will be on the screen, and we will be able to go
  17 through it in that sense. You won't have the ability to
  18 flick through pages doing it this way, but if there is
  19 another page you would like to see, we can hopefully
  20 work through that. And I have a hard copy myself.
- 21 A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. So this is, as you can see it on the screen, PIRC 04154
  and it says "Management policy file" at the top, and we
  see handwriting. Is that your handwriting?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. It gives "Date of crime/incident 3rd May 2015".
- 2 Mr Little's name is there and your own name is there.
- 3 Do we see this is -- we saw the typed version a moment
- 4 ago. Is this effectively what it was typed from?
- 5 A. Yes. I started completing this on the 5th and that is
- 6 why you have got the anomaly where basically Billy and
- 7 me flip roles come the 6th. But I had started writing
- 8 this on the 5th.
- 9 Q. Tell us, what is a management policy file? What is it
- 10 for?
- 11 A. It is to basically manage the investigation from
- 12 a strategy and a policy perspective. All major
- investigations usually have a management policy file,
- 14 and it is to record your high level decisions; setting
- out the progress of the investigation in a structured
- 16 way, your thought processes, why are we doing this.
- Now, that translates into a series of actions. So,
- for example, you might have a forensic strategy. You
- 19 would record your forensic strategy and then that gets
- 20 converted into a series of actions by staff which is: go
- 21 out and seize productions, submit them to a lab, get
- 22 examinations done. So it's quite high level policy and
- 23 strategy. It is not a series of actions, but equally it
- is to chart the development of the investigation and
- 25 record what is your considerations, what your reasons

1 sometimes for taking the investigation in this direction 2 or whatever, so it's quite a high level document. Now, 3 all senior investigating officers, whether they be in 4 the police, PIRC or wherever, are trained in management 5 policy files. Q. We obviously know this is your document and you started 6 it and created it. What role would normally be 7 responsible for creating and starting a management 8 policy file? 9 10 Α. It is usually the senior investigator or senior investigating officer within the police. 11 12 Q. Would that be like the lead investigator in PIRC or 13 someone with the title "senior investigating officer"? Yes, but usually you only have a management policy file 14 Α. 15 for those large-scale investigates. You don't have them 16 for smaller investigations. It is only for large-scale 17 investigations. Within the police, that is primarily murders or major enquiries. Let's say, a terrorist 18 19 investigation, a terrorist incident. It is quite high 20 level. But for more general crime you certainly 21 wouldn't do that and within PIRC it is for the 22 large-scale investigations. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. That sets us up for this afternoon, 23 but I am conscious of the time. Would that be 24 an appropriate moment to rise? 25

1 LORD BRACADALE: We will stop for lunch now and sit at 2 o'clock. 2 3 (1.01 pm)4 (The short adjournment) 5 (2.00 pm)6 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 7 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. We had just turned to your log --8 A. Yes. Q. -- before lunch, and I wonder if we can go back to that 9 10 and have it on the screen, please, if we can move to the second page. We will see at the top of page 2 it says: 11 12 "Decision No 1." 13 Α. Yes. And you said before lunch that this management policy 14 Q. 15 file is designed to record high level decisions that are taken? 16 Yes. 17 Α. Does that involve all high level decisions? 18 Q. 19 Due to the nature of it, a lot of the decisions may be Α. 20 taken by Crown and then passed to us. Where Crown are 21 issuing additional instructions I would usually record 22 it within the policy file, and I think as we move on we will see that. 23 24 Some decisions are natural to any investigation. So although you may record them, you don't really need to 25

1 go into depth because broadly everybody understands what they are. For example, house-to-house enquiries, you 2 3 don't actually need to specify what a house-to-house 4 enquiry is because everybody involved in 5 an investigation understands what that is. You might need to set the parameters for the house-to-house 6 7 enquiry, and in this case it was the route Mr Bayoh took from his home to Hayfield Road. So you would set those 8 9 things. So it is quite a high level, you don't 10 necessarily need to go into detail, because, as I said earlier, that will translate into a series of actions to 11 12 be issued to staff to complete. 13 Looking at that decision number 1, you have Q. 14 a description of the investigation? 15 Α. Yes. If we just move to the bottom of that page for a moment, 16 Q. I think we will see it says: 17 "Officer making decision." 18 19 Your signature appears there on the true copy and 20 the date and time is given 5 May 2015. 21 Α. Yes. 22 So before we look through the content of this page, can Q. you tell the Chair -- obviously this relates to 23 an investigation that started on 3 May? 24 25 Α. Yes.

- 1 Q. You arrive back at work on 5 May and start the policy
- 2 log?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. You are giving a description of the incident here on
- 5 May. Did you prepare this on 5 May on the basis of
- 6 your knowledge at the time --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- or was it prepared retrospectively?
- 9 A. No, it is prepared at the time. Some entries are
- 10 prepared retrospectively, and I think I explained that
- in my Rule 8 statement, so you may be away from the
- office, at meetings or things like that, so you might
- not be able to complete that day or even the next day,
- 14 so you would retrospectively complete it. And if I do
- 15 retrospectively complete it, I tend to indicate that it
- has been retrospective, what has actually happened and
- 17 then when I create the entry. Again, that is just for
- 18 the purposes of transparency. If I could also say my
- 19 habit in every investigation, murder or other
- investigation, is always to give a narrative of what my
- 21 understanding is in decision 1 as to my understanding of
- 22 what happened, albeit sometimes that can be quite
- 23 limited.
- 24 Q. So decision 1 may not necessarily be a decision that has
- been taken, but perhaps a summary of your understanding

- 1 at that time?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. If the Chair looks at the date on any of these pages, and as in here we see it is 5 May, was that the date
- 5 that you prepared this summary?
- Yes. It would be late in the day because obviously 6 Α. 7 I was reading the briefing paper, I was getting briefed by staff, holding lots of discussions and things like 8 9 that, examining some material that had come in. And you 10 might pick up on it as we go through it. Because we 11 were aware, for example -- and that is why I referenced 12 DC Derek Connell's statement which was provided on the 13 4th and that indicated that the knife had been found 14 a distance away from where the interaction with Mr Bayoh 15 took place. Consequently there was no certainty --I know you have spoken about it during the Inquiry, but 16 17 this narrative that was presented on day one that Mr Bayoh was potentially in possession of the knife when 18 he confronted the police officers and that indicated to 19 20 me probably or possibly he did not have possession of 21 that knife because it was found a distance away from 22 where the incident -- I think it was 30-40 yards away, so that indicated to me that what we knew up to that 23 24 stage may not be accurate.
- Q. That was information that was known to you on 5 May by

1

2 Α. Yes. Just to be clear about that, we have heard evidence 3 Q. 4 about a briefing note --5 Α. Yes. Q. -- which was dated 3 May. Perhaps we could look at that 6 7 for a moment. It is PIRC 03694. This will come up on the screen in a moment. Just to give you some of the 8 9 background, we heard from Mr Harrower that he had 10 prepared this briefing note on 3 May, based on the information he had at that time. 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 And that was then used and Mr Little saw it on the 4th Q. and then we may hear that  $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$  am I to understand you saw 14 15 this briefing note on the 5th? 16 Α. Yes. So that is PIRC 03694. I can summarise this really. We 17 Q. 18 heard in relation to the briefing note on page 2 at 19 paragraph 4 that it was reported -- this is on 3 May: 20 "It was reported that as the officers drove into 21 Hayfield Road they saw the now deceased coming toward 22 them as the vehicles came to a halt. They could clearly see he was in possession of a knife and was making his 23 way towards them. Some of the officers (unknown how 24 many at this stage) drew their police issue batons. At 25

the time you prepared this decision number 1?

1 least one of the officers also drew their PAVA spray and issued a warning to the now deceased, who continued to 2 3 come forward." 4 The summary of that I put to Mr Harrower was that 5 this was describing a subject who was the aggressor in that situation, and the police had responded to that 6 7 aggression using batons and spray? 8 Α. Yes. We had asked previous witnesses why in this decision 9 Q. 10 number 1, which -- we will just keep with this decision 11 number 1, if we can look at that page, just maybe 12 further up, we see that you have written here about 13 events of the early hours, we can move down, please: 14 "On being detained/arrested, Sheku Bayoh struggled 15 with police officers who physically restrained him. Officers used CS/PAVA spray during the arrest and used 16 police batons against the deceased." 17 Yes. 18 Α. 19 Q. So we can see clearly that there is no reference there 20 to what is contained in the briefing note, that the 21 officers could clearly see he was in possession of the 22 knife and making his way towards them? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. That was because you had seen DC Connell's statement by 25 then?

1 Α. DC Connell's first statement is dated 4 May. As I said, I don't know what your reference is but it was statement 2 3 22A within the PIRC statements. And his attention had 4 been drawn to the knife lying a distance away from where 5 the incident occurred. He had then photographed the knife and then lifted or seized the knife. So 6 7 I thought: I need to be cautious about assumptions here because although we were told on the 3rd, and it's in 8 the briefing document you referenced, that he was in 9 10 possession of the knife coming toward them, well, that didn't really square with the fact that the knife is 11 12 found 30-40 yards away, and that is why I am not being 13 definitive about that within my narrative. Q. If we can carry on looking at the latter half of the 14 15 page, there is then a section for a reason and you have explained that this technically wasn't reason, it was 16 17 a narrative. And it says: "[He] was taken to the ground by police officers 18 19 where he was handcuffed to the rear and had leg 20 restraints applied." 21 That was the information that was available to you at the time? 22 23 A. Yes. Q. "[He] lost consciousness and appeared to suffer cardiac 24

arrest. CPR was administered by police officers and

25

1 an ambulance summoned. On arrival Mr Bayoh was placed in the ambulance and CPR continued. He was taken to 2 3 Kirkcaldy Victoria Hospital where he died. Life was 4 pronounced extinct at 0904 hours." 5 Α. Yes. Once you complete these he forms, I think you have said 6 Q. 7 you sign these pages? 8 Α. Yes. Do you check them for accuracy at that time? 9 Q. 10 Α. It's as accurate as your knowledge is at that time. 11 Right, so it's -- is it fair to say it is a snapshot of Q. 12 where you are at that stage, when you sign? 13 Yes, obviously as you progress through any investigation Α. you are gathering evidence, you are gathering witness 14 15 statements, so it can be an evolving picture. But it is as accurate as you know at that time. 16 Q. Let's move on to the next page. It remains decision 17 18 number 1, which you have explained, that is 19 the continuation, and it says: 20 "Police Scotland secured the incident scene and 21 appointed an SIO [Detective Superintendent] Pat Campbell~..." 22 There was: 23 24 "Incident scene protocols to recover evidence and 25 undertake forensic scene examination were put in place."

1 You mention Garry McEwan, the divisional commander, who was appointed the PS incident manager. 2 3 Now, where was that information from that 4 Garry McEwan was the Police Scotland incident manager? 5 I can't recall that -- excuse me, frog in my throat. Α. I can't remember where that came from but I think it 6 is more the critical incident manager, he -- the 7 incident had been declared a critical incident, you have 8 9 a police incident officer who is usually a sergeant or 10 inspector that manages the immediacy of what happened or the incident scene itself. But because this had been 11 12 declared a critical incident, Mr McEwan had been really 13 I should say there "critical incident manager" but I have just recorded it as PS incident manager. 14 15 Q. We have heard Garry McEwan was responsible for declaring this a critical incident? 16 Yes. 17 Α. 18 Q. So that became his responsibility? 19 Yes. Α. Thank you. Then it says: 20 Q. 21 "Police Scotland notified the Scottish Fatalities Investigation Unit ... of [Crown Office] and notified 22 them of the death. Mr David Green ... instructed that 23 PIRC would investigate the death with Police Scotland 24 investigating the incidents leading up to the death." 25

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. So even at that stage when you signed this page on the
- 3 5th you were aware that there had been -- what has been
- 4 called a parallel investigation or a split in the
- 5 investigation and I think you have already described
- 6 that actually today in evidence. Police Scotland were
- 7 doing the lead-up, PIRC were dealing with the events at
- 8 Hayfield Road, and at the hospital?
- 9 A. Yes. I think also on the 5th -- and I can't remember
- 10 when the letter from Crown came in, broadening our terms
- of reference. Now, I can't remember seeing it on the
- 12 5th but I know it was dated the 5th from Crown, and
- 13 consequently our terms of reference expanded, probably
- from the 6th onwards.
- Q. We will come on to that in a moment. But my
- understanding is that that letter was dated the 5th?
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. So it's at some point on that date the terms of
- 19 reference were expanded to cover both the lead up and
- the events from the Hayfield Road as well?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. "About 0935 hours, Sunday 3rd May ... Mr Green contacted
- 23 the on-call PIRC DSI Keith Harrower and instructed PIRC
- 24 to investigate the death as per above.
- 25 "PIRC staff were called out and attended Kirkcaldy

1 where they met with Police Scotland staff, including their SIO [Detective Superintendent] Campbell. Joint 2 3 forensic and incident scene strategies were agreed and 4 overseen by PIRC investigators." 5 Would you describe this as a high level description 6 of what was happening? 7 Α. Yes. There is no times given there or detailed information 8 Q. 9 about handovers or information that was provided? 10 Α. No, because I think the detail would come slightly later. This was me recording my understanding of events 11 12 up to that point. Some of the detail may have been 13 lacking, we might not have had that detail, and that is 14 why I tend to be -- it's quite high level, I am not 15 going into too many specifics at this point. Q. Is it fair to say -- we have heard evidence that other 16 17 officers who were involved on 3 May had their own 18 notebooks or perhaps daybooks, we have heard about a policy log from Pat Campbell, so there would be other 19 20 documentation available as well as your own log? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Thank you. Can we move on to the next page, which again Q. continues decision number 1: 23 "PIRC investigators Ferguson and Taylor dealt with 24 25 the hospital scene and arranged the transport of the

deceased to the City Mortuary, Edinburgh. PIRC 1 investigators Sinclair and Rhodes dealt with the 2 3 incident scene at Hayfield Road and productions seized 4 at Kirkcaldy Police Office including officers' clothing, PAVA spray, police batons." 5 We have heard evidence from Mr Little about that. 6 7 Α. Yes. Q. And then you mention: 8 9 "A post mortem examination was arranged for Monday, 10 4 May ... at the Mortuary, Edinburgh." And on to the next section: 11 12 "PIRC FLOs Alistair Lewis and John Clerkin were 13 appointed." 14 And then it says: 15 "About 2210 hours 3 May ... PIRC investigators met with the deceased's family and provided an overview of 16 17 the role of the PIRC." Can I ask you, this is obviously describing events 18 19 on 3 May? 20 Yes. Α. 21 Q. Was it your understanding that it was on 3 May that 22 Alistair Lewis and John Clerkin had been appointed as FLOs? 23 A. I think it was the 4th. Because we didn't have any FLOs 24 on duty or available to us on the 3rd. As we know, 25

1 there was a debate about Police Scotland FLOs and 2 consequently when Police Scotland decided not to deploy 3 FLOs, Keith Harrower and I think it was Alex McGuire 4 went to see the family to explain, you know: we're PIRC, 5 we have been instructed to investigate, and it is our intention to then deploy FLOs the next day, which would 6 7 be the 4th. So that is my understanding. Q. And that understanding, was that from Mr Little when you 8 9 arrived on the 5 May? 10 Α. Yes. He has given evidence that he contributed information to 11 Q. 12 you so that you could have it for the log? 13 Α. Yes. Would you agree with that? 14 Q. 15 Α. Yes. Did much of the information about the preceding 16 Q. two days' events come from Mr Little? 17 I would say it came from a combination -- primarily 18 Α. 19 Mr Little, but it came from a combination, so reading 20 documents, there was documents starting to arrive in 21 from Police Scotland, so you read as much as 22 practicable. You also get briefings from some of the staff, but up until that point obviously Billy had been 23 in charge, so primarily from Billy but from some other 24 25 sources as well.

- 1 Q. "DSI Harrower requested statements from officers
- 2 involved as witness to the incident. Status of the
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Tell us about why you have put that with an exclamation
- 6 mark?
- 7 A. I think what I have said in my Rule 8 statement is I can
- 8 no longer remember why I placed the exclamation mark.
- 9 Q. All right. But your understanding at that time is
- 10 statements had been requested from the officers as
- 11 witnesses and they were witnesses?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Not suspects?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. Is there any other possibility between suspect or
- witness?
- 17 A. No, you are either a witness or you are a suspect. To
- be placed into the category of a suspect there must be
- 19 some evidence that indicates criminality on the part of
- 20 a person. And that is just the way things operate. You
- 21 know, you can't treat somebody as a suspect without some
- evidence.
- 23 Q. We have heard that if you are going to be treated as
- 24 a suspect, that that attracts -- that status attracts
- certain protections for you. We have heard you might be

- 1 interviewed under caution. We have heard evidence from
- 2 Conrad Trickett that if you are a suspect you will be
- 3 removed from the PIP process entirely?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Is that correct?
- A. Because you are afforded all the legal protection that
- 7 any member of the public has, which is the right to
- 8 silence, the right to consult a solicitor prior to
- 9 saying anything, you've got to administer the caution,
- so it's a completely different status from that of
- 11 a witness.
- 12 Q. But regardless of whether you are a suspect or
- a witness, you are not compelled to give a statement to
- 14 a police officer?
- 15 A. No, you are not compelled. Largely most people do give
- statements, particularly -- I have run murder enquiries
- in organised crime and it is incredibly difficult to
- 18 actually sometimes get witnesses to speak up. Other
- 19 times everybody speaks up. Sometimes you just have to
- 20 work around that. I think, as you have explored and
- 21 I outlined later on within my rule 8 statement, the
- 22 unique nature of police officers where police officers
- are allowed to use force up to and including lethal
- 24 force, but they must be accountable for the use of that
- force. Equally there is there normally within the

1 legislation where in a Crown-directed investigation PIRC have less powers than in a police-referred 2 3 investigation, where there is a degree of compulsion 4 that we can apply to police officers in 5 a police-referred one, where -- and it comes within Regulation 5 of the 2013 PIRC regulations, where we can 6 require a police officer to provide us with any 7 information within their knowledge and we can decide the 8 9 format that that should be in, so: I want you to provide 10 informing in the form of a statement. But we did not have that power and still do not have that power in 11 12 a Crown-directed investigation. The legislation is 13 complex. Q. I think you have explained earlier there is the 14 15 Crown-led investigation and the Chief Constable-referred that can become an investigation? 16 Yes. 17 Α. 18 Q. Although you have certain powers to compel officers to give statements if it is a Chief Constable referral, 19 20 that doesn't exist if it is Crown-led? 21 Α. That is correct and I think Dame Elish Angiolini in her 22 report into police conduct matters has made recommendations which are within the current Police 23 Conduct and Ethics Bill, where there should be a duty of 24 candour placed on police officers to provide an account 25

1

no matter what the circumstances. 2 Is that because of their special states as police Q. 3 officers? 4 Α. Yes, and I think Dame Elish had identified -- well, it 5 was certainly brought to her attention and she took cognisance of it, of the anomaly within the legislation 6 7 where the more serious the investigation a Crown-directed death, PIRC investigators had less 8 9 powers than in a police-referred one, it seemed to be 10 upside down. You know, the more serious the investigation, the more powers you should have. 11 12 Now, I know we also heard from Ms Boal, you put the 13 question to Ms Boal that you cannot actually physically 14 force a pen into any person's hand, but there has never 15 been another occasion before the investigation of Mr Bayoh, or after the investigation of Mr Bayoh's 16 17 death, where police officers have refused to provide 18 statements. 19 Right. Thank you. I think it is fair to say in your Q. 20 Inquiry statement you have given some information about 21 the proposed duty of candour --22 Α. Yes. -- that may apply. Thank you. Let's move on to the 23 Q. 24 next page, please. I think this is when we turn to decision number 2, and this is also an entry from 5 May? 25

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. So you were creating this on that date, if I understand
- 3 correctly.
- 4 A. Yes, Billy had instructed the setting up of the incident
- 5 room on the 4th but I thought it important to record
- 6 that this was a major enquiry and that is why I made
- 7 that entry.
- 8 Q. Do you know why Mr Little hadn't created a management
- 9 policy file on the 4th, or even Mr Harrower on the 3rd?
- 10 A. Probably because they were both active in doing things
- and tied up. We know for example Billy Little had the
- post mortem to go to on the 4th, and then he had to
- travel through to Kirkcaldy, and of course Keith was
- 14 very active on the 3rd, the date of incident itself. So
- potentially they just didn't have the opportunity.
- Q. So decision number 2:
- "Establish a PIRC major enquiry to investigate the
- death of [Mr] Bayoh with appropriate major investigation
- 19 roles and strategies."
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. We heard evidence from Mr Little, who said he had set up
- 22 a major investigations team effectively --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. -- with numerous staff, and he was appointing roles to
- 25 individual investigators and allocating tasks?

- A. Yes, and I think that is why I am just formally recording it within the management policy file.
- Q. When it mentions the word "strategies", could you give
  us a summary of the sort of strategies that we may see
  in the remainder of the file?
  - A. Yes, well, I think sometimes there is a merging of the term "policy" or "strategy", so you will have a forensic strategy, and that is to recover forensic evidence, so there's the seizing of the productions, the examination of them at the forensic lab etc, you would hold a forensic strategy meeting, you would record the meeting and what was decided at the meeting. So that is a forensic strategy.

Within all major investigations, so you would have like a CCTV strategy, you would have a media strategy, and that is setting out at high level what the intent is.

So the CCTV strategy undoubtedly starts with let's recover every available CCTV, and that gets translated into a series of actions allocated to staff to go out and recover that CCTV. In a high profile event, in this instance the terrible death of Mr Bayoh, there's a lot of media attention so you need a media strategy. Now, primarily that is handled by your media team but you will record in here that we will have a media strategy.

1 Q. We may also hear there would be a family liaison strategy and things like that? 2 3 Yes, so again you would set that at a high level but Α. 4 primarily family liaison is thereafter managed by the 5 FLOs themselves who keep a separate FLO log of all that 6 interaction. 7 Q. And then the reason is given you wish to: "Undertake a comprehensive and thorough 8 9 investigation into the death ... to capture and collect 10 all available evidence [for] Crown Office." 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. Then the next page covers decision number 3 and this 13 again is prepared on 5 May, and it is headed: "Major investigation - roles and responsibilities." 14 15 And a list of names and suchlike is given and we actually looked at that when we looked at the typed 16 17 version. 18 Α. Yes. 19 You were mentioned there as giving oversight? Q. 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. Which you have explained. The next page is decision number 4 and this is where we see a reference to the 22 forensic strategy, and you have said: 23 24 "Implement a forensic strategy to identify, recover

and examine all relevant material pertinent to the

25

investigation." 1 2 If we move on to the next page for a moment, do we 3 actually see you have helpfully attached a forensic 4 strategy here? 5 Α. Yes. Which is a typed document which you've slipped into the 6 Q. 7 relevant section of your log? Yes. Usually if there's pertinent documents rather than 8 Α. 9 repeating them within it, I will just attach -- so 10 simply to say we are having a forensic strategy then I attach the typed up forensic strategy rather than 11 12 having to rewrite it. The forensic strategy lists the policy, the reason and 13 Q. 14 then the strategy is listed there as bullet points? 15 Α. Yes. It covers a large number of areas where forensic science 16 Q. 17 will be asked to assist in your investigation? 18 Α. Yes. And that includes the post mortem but also: 19 Q. 20 "Examination of the knife found at the scene~..." 21 Α. Yes. "... for DNA [it says], fingerprints and other evidence; 22 Q. "Comparison of the knife with knives from the home 23 24 of the deceased to identify whether they appear a matching set." 25

1 And then other things such as photographs, CCTV, physical items, recovery of mobile phones and other 2 3 articles and examination of vehicles as well. Then 4 towards the bottom of that page we see: 5 "Examination of officers' clothing, radios, et cetera, for blood, footmarks and other relevant 6 7 evidence." 8 Α. Yes. So is this effectively PIRC investigators setting out 9 Q. 10 the scope of the forensic examination that they wish carried out? 11 12 Α. Yes. If we can move on to decision number 5 on the next page. 13 Q. This is dated 7 May, there is obviously a gap? 14 15 Α. Yes. There's no entry, as far as I can see, for the 6th. Is 16 Q. there an explanation for that? 17 Yes, I think I was busy out of the office on the 6th, 18 Α. I think on the 6th I went to see Mr Anwar and the family 19 20 and then from there I then headed up to Kirkcaldy to 21 meet with DCI Keith Hardie and his deputy, who I think 22 was Stuart Wilson. By that time Keith Hardie had taken over from Pat Campbell as the SIO and I wanted to meet 23 with him and again inform him that I considered the 24 25 officers' status to be that of witnesses and I had asked

24

25

is?

1 him to individually approach each of the officers, notify them that I considered them to be witnesses, and 2 3 to request statements from them. 4 I also backed that up with an email and told them 5 that I wanted an individual response from each of the officers. So I was basically tied up on the 6th, so 6 7 that is why I probably am writing this retrospectively, because I was out of office doing things. 8 Q. So out of the office on the 6th, meeting with the 9 10 family? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. And was that the first time that you had met with the 13 family? 14 Yes, we met in Mr Anwar's former offices at Α. 15 Carlton Place. Q. You have also said you went to Kirkcaldy and met with 16 17 DCI Hardie? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. You described him as the SIO. We have also heard him 20 described as the single point of contact? 21 Α. Yes. By that date, 6 May, he had, we understand, become 22 Q. 23 a single point of contact. Can you explain what an SPOC

A. Yes. So we in PIRC, as I think mentioned by others

including Billy Little, we do not have access to police systems. So we don't know what duty that officer is on on a particular day, what shift they are on, whether they're on annual leave, whether they are sick, whether they are on a night shift or anything like that. So we always direct requests for various documentation because if we try and go and get all that stuff ourselves it is -- a lot of stuff is scattered throughout

Police Scotland, so STORM material and radios will be at an area control room, for example -- you will have stuff scattered all over Police Scotland.

Therefore the easiest way, and it's always been the case, right back since the establishment of PIRC, is that we operate through a single point of contact, so we ask Police Scotland to appoint an officer as a single point of contact and we direct all such requests for whatever to that single point of contact. It is then the single point of contact's job to go and obtain that material because they will have access to police systems, they will know a lot of the people involved, consequently that is the most economic way to go about it, rather than us chasing all over the place trying to find out what the material is. Single point of contact, and that is the way it happens. And that is the way it operates today. For every investigation they appoint

1 a single point of contact.

- Q. When you say "they appoint a single point of contact", who is "they"?
- Α. Police Scotland. Sometimes there can be three single points of contact -- I know that sounds a bit contradictory but in some major investigations, so you might have a single point of contact within area control rooms to obtain all that material, you might have one for the general investigation, and you might have one for specialist areas like firearms or for the more sensitive side of the business, that the rest of the police might not have access to.

So, as I say, you could have two or three single points of contact. A lot of times Police Scotland will come back to you, and say: look, it's not practical for one person to do all this, can we split it up and we will tell you who to contact within the various business areas. Usually we will agree to that. It's preferable that it all goes through one person but sometimes it is not feasible. But other times -- I think what we have also got to remember is that these officers have, for want of a better expression, their day job to do, so it is quite a heavy responsibility to run around on behalf of PIRC. And Keith Hardie is also managing their aspect of the major investigation at that point, so ...

- 1 Q. So for convenience, for questions of economy, ideally
- 2 one single point of contact?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Is that to do all communications between PIRC and
- 5 Police Scotland?
- 6 A. Largely, yes.
- 7 Q. Largely. So if you wish something from the individual
- 8 officers like a statement, or some sort of account to be
- given, would that go through the single point of
- 10 contact?
- 11 A. Yes. We do not directly -- excuse me, we do not
- 12 directly approach the police officer, we act through the
- single point of contact, they transmit the message
- onwards to the officers.
- Q. So that is the practice. What if you decide you wanted
- to go to the officers direct?
- 17 A. Well, one, as I explained just a short period of time
- ago, we don't have access to police systems so we don't
- 19 know whether they are on duty, we do not doorstep
- 20 officers at their family homes --
- 21 Q. Would you have access to personal details as to where
- they live?
- A. No, we don't. And that is why we've got to go through
- 24 the SPOC. The SPOC will tell us when the officer is on
- 25 duty. And the normal practice is to see them when they

25

1 are on duty at their place of work. Sometimes we can ask for their shifts to be changed so that --2 for example, if they are night shift but we want to 3 4 interview them, they might change their shift to a day 5 shift so that we can interview them during the day. If that is not practicable, there have been some occasions 6 7 where PIRC staff will come out and do a night shift and go and interview the officer because they are night 8 shift. 9 10 Q. I wonder if you can think of any situation where, instead of going to the single point of contact or in 11 12 addition to that, PIRC have ever made a direct approach 13 to the SPF or to a lawyer representing officers? No, I can't think so. 14 Α. 15 Can you think of any reason why that couldn't be done, Q. or why it isn't done? 16 I think if the officer is a suspect, not a witness, what 17 Α. 18 happens is we notify Professional Standards Department 19 that we consider the officer to be a suspect, and that 20 we want to conduct a suspect interview. That officer 21 can either request that a member of the Scottish 22 Police Federation sit in on the interview to support them or a lawyer is present. That is normal for 23 24 a suspect interview.

Very rarely -- in fact I can't think of any other

25

1 time -- do we approach the officer's solicitor because 2 they don't need a solicitor, they are a witness. Let's 3 remember police officers are professional witnesses, 4 they give statements all day every day, they attend 5 court to give evidence, part of their duty is to give 6 an account, so there wouldn't be a need to go to their 7 solicitor. Particularly in this case, they have been told on day one, day two, Police Scotland had been told, 8 9 the single point of contact had been told, the senior 10 officer has been told we considered them to be witnesses day one, day two, day three, day four, all the way up to 11 12 day seven, when Keith Hardie started to come back to 13 say: I have now individually approached the officers and told them their status as witnesses. 14 15 Q. Perhaps we can just look very briefly at a statement we have looked at from Keith Hardie, PS00667. This is 16 a self-penned statement from DCI Hardie completed on 17 18 27 May 2015 but in relation to events from the week 19 after --20 A. Yes. 21 -- Mr Bayoh's death. We will look at it in a moment but Q. 22 in summary on Thursday 7 May he says in the statement 23 that he: "... received a request from PIRC to make contact 24

with all officers who were known to be involved in the

- 1 arrest of Mr Bayoh and establish whether they were willing to provide an operational statement." 2 3 Was that actually at your request on the 6th? 4 Α. Yes, so I -- myself and Mr Little physically met with 5 him on the 6th. I then backed that up with an email on 6 the 7th, requesting they individually approach the 7 officers. That was to DCI Hardie? 8 Q. 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. We will get this in a second, PS00667. No? There's a slight glitch there. But just to summarise, on Thursday 11 12 7th May there is a series of paragraphs within this statement we have looked at with DCI Hardie in evidence 13 14 from 1.35 in the afternoon that he and DCI Stuart Wilson 15 spoke to Craig Walker, then Daniel Gibson, then James McDonough, then Kayleigh Good, then Alan Smith, 16 17 then Ashley Tomlinson, advising them that they were witnesses, and asking if they wished to provide 18 a statement. And for those officers the uniform 19 20 response was they did not wish to provide a statement at 21 this time on the advice of their solicitor. 22 Α. Yes. Q. Then DCI Hardie goes on to explain in this statement at
- Q. Then DCI Hardie goes on to explain in this statement at
  9.20 on Tuesday, 12 May that he and DI Wilson spoke with
  Temporary Police Sergeant Scott Maxwell, and that he

- 1 also did not wish to provide a statement at this time on
- 2 the advice of his solicitor. The statement itself does
- 3 not indicate that he was advised that his status was
- 4 witness but we have heard evidence from DCI Hardie that
- 5 that was the message that was communicated?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And then on Wednesday, 13 May that Hardie and Wilson
- 8 spoke to PC Paton, who was also advised he was being
- 9 treated as a witness and PC Paton provided he did not
- 10 wish to provide a statement on the advice of his
- 11 solicitor.
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And then on Monday, 18 May, Hardie and Wilson met with
- 14 PC Nicole Short. She was advised that she was being
- 15 treated as a witness, and PC Short provided that she did
- not wish to provide a statement at this time on the
- 17 advice of her solicitor.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. That was an instruction carried out by Hardie, the
- single point of contact, in relation to all of those
- 21 officers on your and Billy Little's instruction?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Thank you. We were on the policy log, PIRC 04154.
- 24 Perhaps we can go back to that and look at decision
- 25 number 5. This entry is on 7 May:

"CCTV and digital evidence strategy."  $\,\,$ 1 So this indicates a decision was taken to implement 2 3 this type of strategy to identify public and private 4 CCTV which existed and to capture any material that may 5 have a bearing on the investigation. And also to recover evidence from mobile phones or electronic 6 devices. Am I right in saying at that time that you 7 were aware that an Ashley Wyse, who lived in the area of 8 9 Hayfield Road, had handed over a mobile phone for the 10 purposes of allowing PIRC to look at Snapchat footage that she had recorded? 11 12 That is correct. Some of this can be slightly Α. 13 retrospective but we have also got to consider does any 14 other member of the public have recorded something and 15 we are unaware of it, have we identified all CCTV that might provide views. We also know that one of the --16 17 one of the witnesses that saw Mr Bayoh walking along the 18 road in the lead-up to the incident had recorded footage 19 on their mobile phone. So this is a broad strategy, 20 let's capture everything we can. We have already got 21 some stuff but this is taking cognisance of everything. 22 Would this include -- we have seen footage from Q. a dashcam --23 24 Α. Yes. 25 Q. -- on a vehicle, would that include that type of digital

1 material that you can gather? Yes, I think that was Harry Kolberg and his son. 2 Α. Q. Yes, thank you. Let's move on to the next page, 3 4 decision number 6. This is from 7 May also. It talks about a major incident room: 5 "Establish a major incident room within PIRC 6 7 utilising the CLUE 2 operation system, and appropriately staffed, to manage all aspects of the investigation." 8 9 We have heard from Billy Little that he did that --10 set that up on the 4th and he had three members of staff --11 12 Α. Yes. 13 -- manning that with Ian McIntyre, I think involved? Q. Yes, I think what I am doing there is formally recording 14 Α. 15 it into the policy log. Again, it's a bit 16 retrospective. The next page is also completed on 7 May. And this 17 Q. relates to family liaison: 18 19 "Two family liaison officers ... were appointed to 20 provide information and support to the family of the 21 deceased. "FLO strategy and recording of contacts will be 22 documented in the separate FLO strategy logs." 23 24 And the FLOs were Alistair Lewis and John Clerkin and they had been appointed. And I think you have just 25

said a moment ago you thought they were appointed on the

- 2 4th?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. So this is a retrospective recording of that?
- 5 A. Yes, but I think it is important to record it in the
- 6 policy log, and to a certain extent you are playing
- 7 catch up a wee bit in the very early stages of
- 8 investigations, so sometimes you think: oh, I have not
- 9 documented that, I will now place an entry. Because
- 10 I know there is -- there is FLOs appointed and there is
- a FLO strategy, so in the early stages some of it is
- 12 retrospective because you are playing catch up.
- Q. In relation to the last couple of items, the CCTV,
- 14 digital evidence strategy, the family liaison strategy,
- we don't see copies of these strategies in this section
- of the log. We have heard part of the evidence of
- Mr Lewis, who was one of the FLOs, and my understanding
- of his evidence is that there was not a written FLO
- 19 strategy.
- 20 A. He should record that in the FLO log. The policy is
- 21 high level, it's appoint FLOs. Potentially -- what the
- 22 FLO does is answer to the SIO but he should be recording
- 23 everything within the FLO log. Now, the FLO strategy
- 24 has got to be flexible and adapt to the situation of
- 25 every family. And it's difficult to take cognisance of

- all the factors, that is why it gets recorded in the FLO log, because as you progress onwards you can establish like family dynamics, all these various factors and that should be recorded in the FLO log. Not in the management policy file. So in the earlier example where we looked at the Q. situation where the forensic strategy was copied and inserted into the log, is there a reason why a FLO strategy was not copied in and inserted into the log? Α. I can't think of one now. But I am assuming, and we
  - A. I can't think of one now. But I am assuming, and we know what everybody says about assumptions, I expected that Mr Lewis and John Clerkin would record that within the FLO log.
  - Q. Who did you expect to write the family liaison strategy?
    - A. Normally it's the FLO themselves. They speak to the SIO and the Deputy SIO, but usually the FLO creates the strategy. To manage the family -- as I said, every incident, every death is different, and therefore a lot of the information that you are getting about the family is coming from the family to the FLOs and that is why it is important that they are managing that aspect of it.

If they become aware of matters that they think should be brought to the lead investigator, the deputy, they would come and tell you. There's got to be a certain extent -- FLOs are highly trained. PIRC FLOs

- do the same training as Police Scotland FLOs, so you
  expect them to manage that quite professionally. And
  Alistair Lewis is a highly experienced FLO as was
  John Clerkin, so you expect them to manage that.
  - Q. In relation to the earlier forensic strategy that we looked at, who had prepared that?
- 7 A. I think I typed that up.

5

6

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. You typed that. So if you had been typing up the family
  liaison strategy would we have seen a copy inside the
  log?
- 11 A. Probably. If I typed up a document -- and you will see 12 it later on as we come across other things, if I typed 13 something up rather than then having to rewrite it into 14 the policy or management file, my habit was simply to 15 attach that document and say "see attached", so ...
  - Q. Was there any expectation on your part -- having entered in the log that there is to be a family liaison strategy, was there any expectation on your part that Lewis or Clerkin would send a copy to you for insertion into the log?
  - A. No, because that would be recorded in the FLO log. The FLO logs are quite large documents, in fact in relation to the death of Mr Bayoh I think there was three FLO logs, which are multiple pages, so the practicality of actually inserting that into this book, it is just not

1

practical. 2 Then if we can look at the reason, so if we move that Q. 3 page up: "Provide appropriate support to the family of the 4 5 deceased, acting as a single point of contact for the receipt and provision of information to/from PIRC." 6 7 Α. Yes. Q. So the idea was that Lewis and Clerkin would be a single 8 9 point of contact --10 Α. Yes. -- for the family. All the information would flow 11 Q. 12 through either of those investigators? 13 Yes. Α. 14 We have also heard that they remain part of the Q. 15 investigation team? 16 Α. Yes. They are not simply there to provide support or 17 Q. emotional wellbeing assistance to the family? 18 19 No. It's quite a large burden being a FLO but they are Α. 20 primarily investigators first and foremost. They have 21 a role in supporting the family and transmitting information to the family but they also have a role in 22 23 acquiring information from the family and feeding that 24 into the investigation. That happens in most death investigations, including murder investigations. First 25

already going on?

8

- and foremost the FLO is an investigator. But they also have a role to play in supporting the family.
- Q. Thank you. Then let's look at decision number 8.

  I think this is also prepared on 7 May and it refers to productions being seized by PIRC and they have to be entered into a productions register and managed. So again, is this you recording things which are actually
- A. Yes, I can't remember -- we had obviously taken 9 10 possession of certain productions, some productions remained with Police Scotland and we were required to 11 12 seize them effectively from Police Scotland. But you 13 are also, as you move forward you are seizing additional 14 items. MI stands for major incident production register 15 so you are recording what the item is, when it was 16 seized, where it was seized, who it was seized by, and 17 where it is stored. It's to keep track because 18 otherwise you can quickly lose track, especially in 19 a major investigation where you are gathering hundreds 20 if not thousands of items, it is very important to try 21 and keep track of that, and this is the major incident 22 production register, so it starts at production number 1 and runs onwards, sometimes into the -- from the 23 hundreds sometimes into the thousands. But you have got 24 25 to keep track of that.

- 1 Q. Do you have an investigator allocated to that role?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. We can move on to decision --
- 4 LORD BRACADALE: If I could interrupt, just before you do
- 5 that could I take you back to the previous decision, the
- one on the family liaison officers. You just explained
- 7 a few moments ago that the FLO was first and foremost
- 8 an investigator, but also had a function to support the
- 9 family.
- 10 A. Yes, my Lord.
- 11 LORD BRACADALE: In your experience do these two functions
- 12 ever give rise to a degree of tension?
- 13 A. They can do. I have experienced it. Not only within
- 14 this one, I have run murder enquiries where the victims
- were figures involved in organised crime. Organised
- 16 crime families, they are not particularly trusting of
- 17 the police to put it politely. Consequently there can
- be a degree of tension between the family liaison
- officers and the family of the deceased. But they have
- a job to do because it's important that we acquire
- 21 information about the deceased, about sometimes family
- 22 dynamics, provide them with information, and
- 23 particularly where in a murder investigation if you
- reach a successful conclusion and arrest people, you
- 25 will wish to inform the family of that before it hits

1 the media. So, as I say, primarily they are investigators, 2 3 sometimes there can be a bit of conflict there, I have 4 experienced it in murder investigations I have ran. 5 Usually things can be calmed through the FLOs being sensitive in how they approach the family and try and 6 7 build bridges or remove barriers. I hope that answers your question, my Lord. 8 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. 9 10 MS GRAHAME: We have heard some evidence from -- just continuing with this family liaison for a moment, we 11 12 have heard some evidence about the role of the 13 senior investigator --14 A. Yes. 15 Q. -- in connection family liaison officers. What were 16 your responsibilities in relation to liaising or working 17 with family liaison? 18 Α. Usually in any investigation where there is a death my 19 preference as a lead investigator was always to meet the 20 family at the start, just to introduce myself as the 21 person in charge of the investigation. The FLO would thereafter take over that sort of liaison function. 22 That was my individual preference. I think it is 23 Billy Little's preference as well, I think he 24 potentially said so. And it's more as courtesy to 25

25

Α.

Yes.

1 introduce yourself: I'm the lead investigator, 2 particularly when it comes to PIRC because not 3 everybody -- there is still quite a lot of members of 4 the public don't understand who PIRC are and our role, 5 so you want to make that introduction more from 6 a familiarity perspective but then the FLOs take that 7 forward. Q. Can we move on, please, to decision number 9. This 8 9 again is entered into the log on 7 May but it is headed 10 up, "Post mortem examination". We have heard evidence that this took place on 4 May. 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 And that Billy Little was present at that examination. Q. 14 It says it was undertaken at Edinburgh City Mortuary at 15 13.00 hours on Monday, 4 May. We have heard there was a Quaser examination roughly between 12 o'clock? 16 Yes. If I may, ma'am, I think this is more me putting 17 Α. 18 a narrative entry rather than a decision entry. 19 You mention the pathologist who is there from PIRC. You Q. 20 mention Police Scotland, DC Peter Grady and also in 21 attendance a number of people there. Peter Gilzean, Ricky Casey, Billy Little, Stuart Taylor, Keith Hardie 22 Bernie Ablett and SPA Derek Carroll, who was 23 a photographer? 24

1 MS GRAHAME: I am conscious we often have a break for the 2 stenographer now. Would that be an appropriate time? 3 LORD BRACADALE: Yes. We will have a 15-minute break at 4 this point. 5 (3.01 pm)6 (A short break) (3.22 pm)7 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 8 9 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. We were looking at decision 10 number 9, and this was a narrative prepared on 7 May and it relates to the post mortem examination. Decision 11 12 number 9. It's page 609861 according to the log. You 13 are narrating there that there has been a post mortem. 14 We have heard evidence that was on 4 May. 15 That is right. Α. So you are preparing this around three days later. Was 16 Q. 17 this prepared after a discussion with Mr Little, because 18 we have heard he attend the post mortem? A. Its would have been. And of course you want to record 19 20 that the cause of death is unascertained pending further 21 investigation, as there will be further investigation 22 thereafter. So Billy Little went to the post mortem, he would have informed me, I would have recorded it in here 23 so there is a record within the policy file of the 24 25 post mortem.

- 1 Q. So there is something recording that there has been
- 2 a post mortem and what the preliminary cause of death is
- 3 at that stage?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. We have heard evidence from Mr Little he prepared a note
- 6 regarding the post mortem, who was in attendance,
- 7 matters of that sort. Did you have sight of that note?
- 8 I can let you see it. It's PIRC 04148.
- 9 A. To be honest I can't remember at this stage
- 10 whether I had sight of it or not.
- 11 Q. We won't go into that in detail. I want to ask you
- about the people who were in attendance. You may have
- seen me ask Mr Little about this, if you have been
- 14 observing any of his evidence. But there are three
- police officers in attendance at the post mortem:
- 16 DC Peter Gilzean, DCI Keith Hardie, and
- a DC Peter Grady.
- 18 A. Yes.
- Q. We have heard evidence that the Crown have instructed
- 20 PIRC to investigate the incident at Hayfield Road, and
- 21 effectively the cause of death of Mr Bayoh.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. PIRC are attending the post mortem, we have heard that
- that is arranged under instruction of the Crown?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. But the cause of death is something that is within the 2 term of reference of PIRC?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. We see that three police officers are present at the post mortem.
- 6 A. Yes.

- Q. We asked Mr Little about that, and I would like to ask
  you, although you were noting this on 7 May, do you have
  any views on police officers attending part of what is
  supposed to be an independent PIRC investigation?
  - A. I think what we have got to remember in this case, and it's happened in other cases, is that the police are part of the investigation. We have the investigation of the death but at that stage, at the time of post mortem, the police were investigating the incident in Arran Crescent outside the deceased's home, where he had a violent confrontation with his friend, Mr Saeed. So potentially he may have picked up injuries at that.

Now, I am presuming that is potentially why the police were at this post mortem. I have seen it before in other post mortems where the police -- as I described the fatal shooting in the hotel in Glasgow where the police have got part of the actions, because the deceased had injured himself while assaulting people in the lead up to it, so part of those injuries are

- 1 pertinent to the police investigation, the majority are
- 2 pertinent to the PIRC investigation. It is not usual
- 3 but it does occur.
- 4 Q. You think that could be an explanation why DC Grady,
- 5 DC Gilzean and DCI Hardie were present at the
- 6 post mortem?
- 7 A. Potentially but I don't know what was in their minds or
- 8 the minds of Police Scotland.
- 9 Q. In a situation where PIRC are leading the investigation
- into the death, would you, if you had been attending,
- 11 expect to ask why the police are there?
- 12 A. I would want to know why they are there. Because ...
- 13 well, why are they there? You know, what role do they
- 14 have now that the death investigation has passed to
- 15 PIRC? As I have said, it's rare but it does occur where
- there has been incidents in the lead up to the death
- that the police have got and therefore some injuries
- 18 might have been picked up during those incidents that
- 19 the police will need to be aware of. Now, there is
- 20 nothing to stop PIRC passing that information back to
- 21 the police. Particularly because once the post mortem
- 22 report itself is issued Crown can give permission for
- 23 that to be shared with the police, and that has
- 24 occurred.
- Q. So the Crown can give permission for that to be shared

- 1 with the police?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Do you think -- are you saying that PIRC can also take
- 4 a decision to issue that information to the police?
- 5 A. Not without Crown permission.
- 6 Q. You have said you would want to know why police officers
- 7 were present. How would you have gone about finding out
- 8 why the police officers were present?
- 9 A. Simply ask them.
- 10 Q. I think we have heard evidence from Mr Little that he
- 11 didn't ask. In terms of the independence of
- 12 the investigation and the Article 2 considerations we
- have been talking about, do you have concerns about
- 14 a post mortem in the circumstances you were in at that
- 15 time, or PIRC were in at that time, where police
- officers are present and PIRC don't know why?
- 17 A. Yes, I would have concern because I would want to know
- 18 why they were there. As I previously said, I am making
- an assumption, and we know the challenge with
- assumptions, but I would want to know why they are
- 21 there, so I would probably just ask them: why are you
- 22 here?
- 23 Q. If you weren't satisfied with the answer or the
- 24 explanation given, what steps would you have taken?
- 25 A. You could tell them: I don't think it is appropriate for

- 1 you to be here. Particularly in high profile ones you
- 2 will you have a Fiscal there, as was the case here,
- 3 Bernie Ablett was there. So you can turn to the Fiscal
- 4 and say: I don't think this is appropriate.
- 5 Q. Would you have felt comfortable raising issues like that
- 6 prior to the post mortem?
- 7 A. If I see issues I raise them.
- 8 Q. Thank you. Mr Little gave evidence that he wouldn't
- 9 normally attend a post mortem. He had enough to do as
- 10 lead investigator in a big investigation, so he would
- 11 normally send someone else --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- to attend. But he gave evidence that he had been
- 14 advised by Mr Ferguson that there was blood in the ears
- of Mr Bayoh.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. To put that in context, Mr Ferguson had been sent to --
- 18 tasked with going to Victoria Hospital in Kirkcaldy, and
- 19 then he was involved in moving the body to the mortuary.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And he was also present at the post mortem. Because of
- 22 that, as I understand Mr Little's evidence, he had
- 23 concerns that the cause of death may have been
- 24 blunt-force trauma to the head.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. There was some information available to Mr Little that
  2 batons had been used at the scene.
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. So he went to the post mortem for that reason, because
  he wanted to know the cause of death as soon as
  possible. I think in summary the potential was that
  this -- the outcome of the post mortem, if there had
- 8 been blunt-force trauma to the head, could have
- 9 potentially changed the status of the officers or
- officer -- an officer who had used a baton?
- 11 A. I am not sure whether it would have immediately changed
- 12 the status of the officers because you had -- as I said
- earlier, police officers are allowed to use force up to
- and including lethal force. You would want additional
- information to understand what happened, why it
- 16 happened, and that then may change the status of the
- officers.
- 18 Q. There's no reference in the decision number 9 in the
- log, no mention at all there of the issue regarding
- 20 blunt-force trauma. I am interested in why there is no
- 21 reference to that. You do mention cause of death at the
- 22 bottom of that page --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. -- being unascertained and further tests are to be
- 25 undertaken. I am interested in why there is no mention

- of this blunt-force trauma issue?
- 2 A. I think because by that stage we knew from the findings
- 3 of the -- the initial findings of the pathologist that
- 4 blunt-force trauma to the head had not caused the death.
- 5 So that is why I wouldn't reference it.
- 6 Q. You knew that how?
- 7 A. Through feedback from Billy Little. Obviously he was at
- 8 the post mortem, he spoke to Dr Shearer, Dr Shearer
- 9 would inform him: look, at present I cannot establish
- 10 a cause of death therefore there needs to be additional
- 11 examination but certainly blunt-force trauma to the head
- 12 did not cause the death.
- 13 Q. I asked Mr Little about whether he had spoken to the
- pathologist about any other potential causes of death,
- to get a preliminary view from her, if that was
- possible, available. I asked him about the possibility
- of positional or mechanical asphyxiation contributing to
- the death, he hadn't spoken to the pathologist about
- 19 that he said. Is that something you would have
- 20 discussed with the pathologist?
- 21 A. I think really we present what is known up to that stage
- 22 to the pathologist. We then await what the
- 23 pathologist's findings are. What we don't want to do is
- 24 colour the judgment of the pathologist because they are
- independent. If you are saying: well, I think

1 positional asphyxia, you are putting an idea into the pathologist's mind. No, let them do their job, provide 2 3 their findings. 4 Now, there are some indicators where you may have 5 positional asphyxia petechial haemorrhages in the eyes, which could be indicative of positional asphyxia. It is 6 7 not necessarily the case because there are other reasons for it, so CPR -- and we know CPR occurred -- can 8 9 sometimes produce small petechial haemorrhages. So it 10 is very much let the pathologist do their job, communicate to us their findings but let's not pre-judge 11 12 matters. 13 Are you suggesting that asking about blunt-force trauma Q. 14 to the head would be putting ideas into the 15 pathologist's head? Certainly there was injuries to Mr Bayoh's head. We 16 Α. 17 know now and we knew then that batons had been recovered at the scene and that officers had used batons on 18 19 Mr Bayoh, so that was a matter of fact and you are 20 presenting that fact to the pathologist. 21 Q. So you don't consider that to be influential or 22 potentially influential in any way? No, that is a matter of fact whereas the other ones are 23 Α. hypothesis: could it be this, could it be that? Well, 24 let the pathologist do their job, report their findings. 25

- If those findings are inconclusive, which they were
  here, the pathologist will then undertake in conjunction
- 3 with experts additional enquiries: toxicology,
- 4 neurological sample etc.

causes of death?

- Q. So if you are trying to avoid influencing the
  pathologist in any way you don't mention other potential
- 8 A. No.

- 9 Q. You do ask about blunt-force trauma. The pathologist
  10 gives you a preliminary view. Are you thinking about
  11 any other possible causes of death at that stage or just
  12 keeping a completely open mind?
- 13 A. You have to keep an open mind.
- Q. Why was there so much interest in blunt-force trauma to
  the head if it wasn't going to be a categoric alteration
  to the status of the officers; why not wait until you
  get the final post mortem?
- 18 Α. What you do is you present the facts as known at that 19 time to the pathologist, to inform them. But you don't 20 stray into the realm of hypothesis. You present the 21 facts, because what happened -- I think the pathologist 22 needs an understanding of what happened or potentially what happened, because they can then examine during the 23 post mortem well, how did these injuries arise. So is 24 there a potential explanation for how those injuries 25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- arose, which is why you present the facts to them as understood at the time.
- Q. Why the interest, do you think, in blunt-force trauma to
  the head if it wasn't going to alter the status of the
  officers; why not simply wait until you get the final
  report? Was there a reason you can think of why there
  was an immediacy or an urgency to finding out about
  the blunt-force trauma to the head?
  - I think it's -- as you have said, John Ferguson flagged Α. up there was blood in the ears to Billy Little, Billy Little then -- he knew batons had been used, he knew Mr Bayoh had been struck with batons, had he been struck to the head with a baton, now we subsequently find out that that did occur, but I don't think we knew exactly. So we are saying he has been batoned, we don't know whether he has been batoned to the head because the officers are not telling us until 32 days later, but we knew batons had been used. That is probably why Billy has specifically wanted that knowledge. So -- because having been struck to the head, a strike to the head by a baton can be a fatal blow. And of course we don't have the nine officers' accounts of exactly what happened at that scene, we were still left trying to piece things together from witness testimony, many witnesses had only seen partial matters, trying to

- figure it out from STORM and Airwaves and all the other
  things. So I'm presuming Billy just wanted a quick
- 3 answer as to is that a potential.

17

18

19

- Q. Did that help -- would that help the investigation
  knowing blunt-force trauma to the head had not caused
  death? Would that allow you to take things forward?
- 7 Yes, it rules out the fact that the blow from the baton Α. to the head caused death because we are then left with: 8 9 okay, so the batons didn't kill him. What was the cause 10 of death? What caused him to die? And very much the initial one was unascertained pending toxicology and 11 12 neurology, and that takes quite a considerable period of 13 time because the samples get sent off to the 14 universities where they get examined and then they come 15 back and get given to the pathologist who writes up the 16 final post mortem report.
  - Q. Would it have been helpful to have blunt-force trauma to the head being excluded noted in the policy log? You have noted here other matters to do with the post mortem.
- A. It might have been but since we knew that it wasn't
  a cause of death, I didn't record it. Now, we can argue
  the pros and cons as to whether I should have put that
  down, but the fact is I didn't.
- 25 Q. I am wondering if it can be of as much assistance to

- 1 know what wasn't the cause as what was the cause?
- 2 A. Yes, certainly sometimes.
- 3 Q. In terms of looking at other decisions which have to be
- 4 made or explored, could knowing what it wasn't help
- 5 narrow down and focus the decisions that you are making
- in the investigation?
- 7 A. It can do. As I said, this was a highly unusual case
- 8 insofar as it's the only investigation we have had in
- 9 the last 11 years where police officers didn't provide
- 10 accounts of what occurred until 32 days later.
- 11 Q. So looking back now in relation to -- obviously with
- 12 hindsight, looking back later to the entry in decision
- number 9 in your log, do you think it may have assisted
- 14 to have reference to this issue regarding blunt-force
- trauma to the head added in here?
- 16 A. Potentially yes. The fact is we did not. Now, I have
- not recorded it in here. Maybe I should have. But
- 18 I didn't.
- Q. Can I ask you about another matter. We have heard
- 20 evidence from Billy Little that he authorised disclosure
- 21 of that information regarding blunt-force trauma to the
- 22 head was not the cause of death to be disclosed to
- the police officers who had attended Hayfield Road.
- 24 There is no mention of that in the policy file regarding
- 25 the post mortem either.

- 1 A. Yes. Now, I don't think I became aware until much later
- 2 that it was Billy's decision because I knew police
- 3 officers had been at the post mortem, I thought it had
- 4 been them that had transmitted that information.
- 5 I didn't realise until much later it was actually
- 6 Billy's decision. So at that time, and at the time
- 7 that I created this, I wasn't aware of it, no.
- 8 Q. Mr Little has described this -- we took his evidence in
- 9 some detail on this and he described it as
- 10 an unprecedented decision that he had taken.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. He had never taken a decision like that before, he has
- never taken a decision like that since. As a decision
- and as an unprecedented decision, do you think that is
- something that should have been noted in the management
- 16 policy file?
- 17 A. Yes. But I wasn't aware of it at the time.
- 18 Q. When did you become aware that this had been a decision
- 19 by Mr Little?
- 20 A. Not for a considerable period afterwards. I was aware
- of it before the officers gave their statements, which
- 22 was on 4 June. But I can't remember exactly when
- I became aware it throughout those 32 days.
- Q. Who was it that told you about this decision?
- 25 A. I think it would be Billy himself.

1 Q. Looking back now, do you think this is a decision that you should have been be told about to insert it into the 2 3 policy log? 4 Α. Probably. 5 Had you been told about it would you have entered into Q. 6 the log? 7 Α. Yes. And as part of that log entry would have noted down the 8 Q. 9 explanation for why that decision was made in the reason section? 10 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. The other thing I would like to ask you about in 13 relation to this page --14 LORD BRACADALE: Just before you do that Ms Grahame, you 15 said a moment ago that you thought that it was the police officers who were at the post mortem that had 16 17 given that information? A. Yes, my Lord. 18 19 LORD BRACADALE: Now, given the evidence that you gave 20 earlier this afternoon about the propriety of the police 21 officers being at the post mortem at all, did that 22 impression that you formed about they having communicated the information give you cause for concern? 23

Once I became aware of it, but at the point

that I became aware of it, it was Mr Little or Billy who

24

25

Α.

1 had communicated that to me to say it was him that passed that -- that information. So it was 2 3 an assumption on my part that it was the police officers 4 but it was actually Billy and I found that out I can't 5 remember when my Lord, but some time before 4 June. LORD BRACADALE: But when you were operating under that 6 7 assumption, did the existence of that assumption itself not cause you some concern? 8 I think as Mr Little explained, it was -- his rationale 9 Α. 10 for doing so was to try and unblock the logjam, I think is how he described it, of the officers refusing to 11 12 provide statements. Chief Superintendent McEwan 13 transmitted the information because he thought it was 14 from a welfare perspective of the officers to let them 15 know because, as I learned, one of the officers was very upset, thinking that the blows to the head could have 16 17 caused the death of Mr Bayoh. So ... 18 LORD BRACADALE: I am more interested at this stage in your 19 own state of mind --20 A. Yes. 21 LORD BRACADALE: -- Mr McSporran. Because if you formed the 22 impression, as you say you did, that this information had been given to the attending officers by police 23 officers who were at the post mortem, whose attendance 24 25 at the post mortem you had concerns about, then would

25

1 that itself not be something that would really exercise 2 you? I think it would. Now, I can't remember my exact 3 Α. 4 mindset back there, my Lord. I think the challenge was 5 it had occurred, I didn't know exactly who had done that. It was an assumption on my part that because the 6 7 police officers were there, they would transmit that information into Police Scotland, and then Mr McEwan 8 9 would contact the officers and notify them. I did not 10 immediately know that it was Mr Little that had passed that information to break the logjam. But I did become 11 12 aware at some point. 13 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. 14 Ms Grahame. 15 MS GRAHAME: Looking back now, if you were in that situation today where you find out that officers have been in 16 17 attendance at a post mortem, where there is an expectation PIRC will carry out an independent 18 19 investigation, but officers are there, you are not sure 20 why they are there, and then later you find out that 21 information has been shared with the nine attending 22 officers, where no statements had been given, looking back at that situation now, what would you do? 23 A. I understand the optics surrounding that because it 24

looks as though we are providing them with something to

1 try and assuage them, for want of a better expression. 2 And I don't necessarily think that that is proper. 3 I understand Billy's rationale because we had at the --4 in the very early days, a complete lack of understanding 5 as to what occurred, and it's the only time so far that police officers have refused to provide statements. 6 7 I understand his rationale. He was trying to break the logjam. This is the only occasion when it has occurred 8 9 because usually we will not pass that information 10 without Crown's approval. So looking back now, in a situation such as this, if it 11 Q. 12 happened now where you think this isn't proper, perhaps 13 you have concerns under Article 2, what steps could you 14 take as a lead investigator to address those concerns? 15 Well, first of all, if there were police officers in Α. 16 attendance, and there have been cases, I would certainly 17 be saying: you cannot pass this information on to any of 18 the principal officers involved, that would be highly 19 inappropriate. Is that something you would do at the time? 20 Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 Or shortly after the post mortem? Q. I would be saying to them shortly after the 23 Α. 24 post mortem: you cannot pass this -- because you need to know the result of the post mortem, you cannot pass this 25

1 onwards. Equally it is a decision for Crown what gets released. It is not for me or any investigator to 2 decide what to pass on to the officers involved. 3 4 As I say, I understand the rationale why Mr Little 5 did it. It's the only time it has occurred. If it were to occur again, I don't think we would. 6 7 So would you -- you would give an immediate warning or Q. order to the officers that they shouldn't pass any 8 9 information on. Would you then go to the Crown to seek 10 permission if there was going to be any disclosure of the preliminary post mortem results? 11 12 Α. I think what we need is a request from Police Scotland. 13 Not just those that are in attendance, a request from 14 Police Scotland to say: can we tell the officers the 15 provisional results? We would then go to Crown and say: this request has come in from Police Scotland, what 16 17 do you want to do? And if Crown say no, then it doesn't 18 get passed. 19 So you would wait until you got the authority of Q. 20 the Crown? 21 Α. Yes. Thank you. Continuing to look at decision number 9, 22 Q. there is also a reference here to: 23 "... non-engagement by the family at that time who 24 declined to attend the PM." 25

25

So this is -- just to recap, you are making this 1 entry on 7 May, regarding the post mortem that has been 2 carried out on the 4th? 3 4 Α. Yes. Where did that information come from? 5 Q. That would have come from Mr Little, and others. 6 Α. 7 So you weren't involved in any way determining whether Q. there had been engagement or willingness to engage to 8 any extent with the family? 9 10 Α. No, because I didn't return to duty until the 5th by which time the post mortem had already occurred. 11 12 Q. Thank you. Can we move on to page 10, please. Sorry, 13 decision number 10. You are then talking about 14 house-to-house enquiries and the work that is being done 15 in relation to that. Police Scotland had initiated the house-to-house strategy, but then that had been taken 16 over by PIRC --17 18 Α. Yes. 19 -- as the terms of reference from the Crown expanded --Q. 20 Α. Yes. 21 -- to include all the events? Q. 22 Α. Yes. We spoke to Mr Little about resourcing at this time, 23 Q. and I asked him about when the terms of reference were 24

expanded, to what extent did your resources expand. Do

- 1 you have a recollection of the resources expanding at
  2 this time?
- The resources -- so the investigative resources did not 3 Α. 4 expand but we requested assistance from the complaint 5 handling review side of the business, and that was to complete the house-to-house. Because if you are 6 7 conducting house-to-house enquiries, you are recording everybody that lives in the house and whether they have 8 9 potentially seen anything. If they have seen anything 10 then you are taking a statement, that is why there are two of you there. So that is why we wanted those 11 12 resources to complete the house-to-house because we had 13 taken it over on the 5th, Police Scotland had had two 14 days of doing that. We were -- we had done part of it, 15 which was the incident scene at Hayfield Road. They had not completed their house-to-house enquiries so we were 16 17 then taking over, that is why we wanted additional resources from complaint handling reviews to allow us to 18 do that and complete it. 19
  - Q. You have entered this entry into the log on 7 May,

    Mr Little was unable to remember when he obtained those
    additional resources from the case handling staff. Was
    it round about 7 May that you obtained those additional
    resources?
- 25 A. Yes, I would think so, because I think as we said

20

21

22

23

- earlier it was later in the week, so Thursday would be
- 2 the 7th or Friday would be the 8th but it was certainly
- 3 before the weekend.
- 4 Q. Then decision number 11 is narrative. Where you note on
- 5 May there was a Crown Office direction that all
- 6 aspects of the investigation including preceding linked
- 7 incidents would now be investigated by PIRC.
- 8 So this is where you record the increase in your
- 9 instruction?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. If we move on to the next page, we can see that letter
- of instruction has been inserted into the log at this
- point.
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. If we look down we can see that it is 5 May, 2015.
- There are two areas which require investigation, and
- this is the circumstances leading up to the incident,
- prior to contact with the police, and also the incident
- 19 itself with Mr Bayoh. This was official authorisation
- from Crown Office?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Turn back, please, to decision number 11 we see you have
- 23 also noted Police Scotland were notified and instructed
- 24 to cease any investigative actions not already in
- progress.

So once you received that letter from the Crown on 1 the 5th, that was then when Police Scotland were 2 3 notified at that point that they should cease their 4 investigations? 5 Α. Yes. So did Police Scotland's actions continue until the 5th? 6 Q. 7 A. Yes. Q. Then you have noted there that this was a wholly -- if 8 9 we can look at the reason: 10 "Wholly independent investigations into all the circumstances of the death." 11 12 And that was the point at which PIRC were in charge of everything? 13 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Thank you. Then if we can move on to decision number 12. Again, this is said to be a narrative, again dated 16 17 7 May. It says: "From witness statements. On the evening of 18 Saturday 2nd May the deceased and his friends ..." 19 20 Then you start to give an explanation of the 21 preceding events? 22 Α. Yes. Q. So you have received the letter of instruction from the 23 Crown, you are looking at everything and is this 24 information that has been given to you by 25

Police Scotland --1 2 Yes --Α. -- in regard to their part of the investigation? 3 Q. 4 Α. Yes, because they had taken statements from Mr Saeed, 5 Mr MacLeod and his girlfriend -- sorry, Mr Dick and his 6 girlfriend Ms MacLeod, who I think is now his wife, so 7 they were transferring those witness statements to us, and of course we were reading those witness statements, 8 9 which gave -- because these are the preceding events so 10 they simply transferred that material to us. 11 Q. So they have delivered these statements to you and 12 handed that over, was there a handover also or was it 13 simply PIRC investigators reading the statements? I think from recollection Police Scotland had been 14 Α. 15 recording matters into the HOLMES incident room but they 16 would also have the statements themselves which would 17 also get typed up, so we would go and physically collect them or collect them in electronic format. 18 19 How quickly are police statements typed up and available Q. 20 to PIRC? 21 Α. Usually pretty quickly. Now, it's not that day but it 22 can be within a day or two, depending on the circumstances. Sometimes it can take a longer period of 23 time. It can vary depending on the officers' duties, 24 there is no set timeframe for it. But it is better that 25

- 1 we get them as soon as possible because it gives us
- 2 a good picture of what occurred.
- Q. So a statement will be taken by a police officer, and
  then within a day or two that should be available on the
  system for PIRC investigators?
- A. As the investigation was transferred to us, all of the investigation was transferred to us, we would say: hand over everything you have got so far.
- 9 Q. So it would be immediately available at that point?
- 10 A. Yes.

24

- Q. Then if a statement is taken by a PIRC investigator, not a police officer, how quickly are those statements available to PIRC?
- They are available immediately because usually what 14 Α. 15 happens is these will be manuscripts, written 16 statements. They come back to the office, they will 17 photocopy it, that will go into the incident room, it 18 can be photocopied a couple of times because myself as 19 SIO or Billy Little might say we want to read that now. 20 But it would also be passed then to our administrative 21 staff who would type that up. And that is to allow it 22 to be entered into our CLUE 2, as it was, operations management system so that it can be searched and the 23
- 25 Q. So if an investigator comes back to the PIRC offices,

contents can be searched.

- they can photocopy a handwritten statement and hand that
- 2 straight to you?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. Was there an expectation that key witnesses or important witnesses would -- their statements would be handed
- 6 direct to you?
- A. Yes, and you would also want the investigator to come
  and brief you, saying: look, I have interviewed this
  person, I consider this a key piece of information. So
  not all witness statements get drawn to your attention
  because they might not be of particular pertinence or
  high profile to the investigation, but you would
- 13 certainly expect if somebody comes across key
- information that adds value to the investigation, that
  they flag that up to you and then show you the
- statement.
- Q. Would that be done on the day or the next day after they have taken the statement, depending on timing?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. So obviously if a statement says "I didn't see
  anything", or "I have nothing to say", that wouldn't
  necessarily be drawn to your attention?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. But if there is information from a witness who has seen something, you would want to know about it straightaway?

1 Α. Yes. 2 In addition to that, do we see at the bottom of this Q. 3 page -- I don't need to go through the entire narrative 4 with you -- there is reference to: "Several members of the public observed the deceased 5 walking along the road carrying a knife and telephoned 6 7 police." By the time this is written up, 7 May, had you been 8 9 able to gather in the STORM records? We have seen STORM 10 records in the Inquiry with information about phone calls made by the public. Was that available to you? 11 12 Α. I think so because that is where we would get the 13 detail. Equally, those were witness that needed to be 14 seen, either initially by the police or by PIRC. Those 15 are obviously key witnesses, because they described the events in the lead-up to the incident. 16 So by 7 May PIRC are in charge of the entire 17 Q. investigation? 18 19 Yes. Α. 20 The police have delivered statements that they had Q. 21 taken. You have your own investigators carrying out work? 22 23 A. Yes. And by this stage are you effectively the lead 24 Q. investigator? 25

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And you are also providing information in the management
- 3 policy log?
- A. Yes, there is a lot of reading to be done during initial
- 5 stages, it is almost information overload. But you just
- 6 have to knuckle down and get on with it, read as much as
- 7 possible. But, as I said earlier, if there is a key bit
- 8 of information you would expect the investigator to flag
- 9 that up to you.
- 10 Q. Can we look at some of the information you may have had
- 11 available. I would like first of all to look at -- we
- have heard evidence that there were two eyewitnesses to
- the events in Hayfield Road.
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And these were key witnesses, Ashley Wyse and
- 16 Kevin Nelson.
- 17 A. Yes, I think there were other people who saw bits of
- 18 what happened. I know there was -- I can't remember the
- 19 witness's name but he saw the struggle on the ground
- 20 with the police officers.
- 21 Q. We have heard a lot of evidence from passers by, people
- 22 who made telephone calls in relation to all of the
- incidents.
- A. So it wasn't just Kevin Nelson and Ashley Wyse, there
- 25 were other people who witnessed some of the actions. So

- 1 they were also key witnesses.
- 2 Q. We have heard from people who were perhaps driving by or
- in the vicinity who maybe saw things; is that the type
- 4 of people you are thinking about?
- 5 A. Yes, I know there was one witness, I can't remember the
- 6 witness's name, that saw the struggle on the ground.
- 7 Q. In relation to events in Hayfield Road, we have heard
- 8 that Ashley Wyse and Kevin Nelson, at that time at
- 9 least, lived in the vicinity and saw parts of the events
- 10 as they panned out?
- 11 A. Yes, Kevin Nelson was a ground floor flat. Ashley Wyse
- was a first floor flat.
- Q. So can I ask you about -- Ashley Wyse gave a statement
- to officers on 3 May.
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. But we are aware that an investigator from PIRC went to
- speak to Ashley Wyse on 5 May at 19.20 hours.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Can I ask you to look at this statement and say when you
- saw that. So it's PIRC 00043. You will see that this
- is a statement, we will see it is taken on 5 May at
- 22 19.20 by investigator Alex McGuire from Ashley Wyse.
- This contained information, if we look at page 2,
- 24 please, look at paragraph 5 which is about halfway down.
- Here we are:

1		"I saw a black man in the street."
2		Do you see that paragraph there?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	"I saw a black man in the street. He was nearly down on
5		the ground. He was surrounded by police officers.
6		There was at least six police officers surrounding him.
7		I saw the police officers all over him. What I mean is
8		they were holding him on the ground."
9		Then if we skim down to the final three paragraphs
10		on that page you can see:
11		"When the man was on the ground I heard him
12		screaming. It was a horrible sound."
13		Then:
14		"I think the black man was on his back when lying on
15		the ground. I'm not sure if he was moved whilst on the
16		ground. I saw him lying on the ground. I could see
17		that his wrists were restrained. His hands/arms were in
18		front of him. The police officers were still lying on
19		top of him.
20		"There then seemed to be a pause, a break. The man
21		had been quiet for a little while. In this period the
22		police officers appeared to be speaking with him.
23		I could not hear any of his responses~"
24		On to the next page:
25		" but it appeared that the police officers were

1 having a conversation with him. "I think the police officers were lying on top of 2 3 him a long time. I think it was at least five minutes 4 they were lying on top of him. It may have been about 5 ten minutes. This includes the time when he was being taped to his legs. At all times he was surrounded by 6 7 Police Officers. There were at least six Police Officers around him at all times." 8 9 So that is just a glimpse of the type of information 10 that was contained within Ashley Wyse's statement to 11 Investigator McGuire. 12 Α. Yes. 13 Now, this was taken at 19.20. Q. 14 That would be when it started. Α. 15 That is when it started, so when would you have heard Q. about the information contained within this statement? 16 Probably the next day because she was a key witness. As 17 Α. we know, she had also recorded part of the interaction 18 19 on her mobile phone. So if they've started that at 20 19.20, I don't know how long it took them to take that 21 statement but then they have got to travel all the way 22 back from Kirkcaldy so they are maybe getting back to the office 10/11 at night and therefore it would be the 23 next day that you would become aware of it. Because we 24 25 knew she was a key witness.

I presume I did.

23

24

25

Α.

Q.

Α.

1 Q. And you would expect Mr McGuire to speak to you about 2 it? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Provide you with a copy of that statement? 5 Α. Yes. So that would be the following day, which would be 6 Q. 7 6 May? A. Yes, I would think so. 8 9 Q. Sorry, I missed out a section that I should perhaps have 10 read to you. Let's look at page 2. It is paragraph 6 11 and it's the final sentence. The paragraph begins: 12 "What it looked like to me was ..." 13 Do you see that paragraph? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Q. And the last sentence of it is: 16 "It looked like one officer was using a baton to 17 hold the man down. It was on his upper chest towards his throat." 18 19 So that is another element of the information that 20 was provided --21 Α. Yes. -- to PIRC. Did you read this statement on the 6th? 22 Q.

Did you have a conversation with Mr McGuire about it?

I can't remember, but since this is key information,

1 I would expect it would have been flagged up to me and 2 Mr Little. 3 Q. Let's look at another statement that I understand was taken on 5 May. PIRC 00019. You will see that this was 4 a statement taken from Kevin Nelson? 5 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. On 5 May 2015 and this one was taken at 1900 hours, so again taken in the early evening? 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. Taken by investigator Kareen Pattenden. Do you see 11 that? 12 A. Yes. 13 It was also in the presence of DSI Brian Dodd. So Q. I understand that is investigator Dodd? 14 15 A. Yes. Q. So two PIRC investigators have taken this statement. 16 17 Again, would you have had the opportunity to -- well, let's look at this statement first. If we can look at 18 page 2, first of all, and I am looking towards the 19 20 bottom of that page, the third paragraph from the 21 bottom. It begins: "When this male ..." 22 23 Do you see that on the screen? 24 Α. Yes.

"When this male started walking along the road he

25

Q.

- appeared to be acting as if the police were not talking
  to him. He ignored everything that was being said. My
  view was clear. I would say the male was about 30 yards
  from me and at this time he did not appear to be
  carrying anything in either of his hands."
- 6 A. Yes.
- Q. I think you said earlier that it was your understanding
  by the time you wrote your initial narrative that
  a statement had been obtained which cast doubt on the
  suggestion that appeared in the briefing note that
  Mr Bayoh had a knife in his hand and was approaching the
  officers?
- 13 Yes, and I think that was the statement of DC Connell Α. 14 which was provided on the 4th, because he recovered the 15 knife and we knew that the knife had been recovered. I know we have seen photographs and video of 16 17 the incident scene, but it was recovered near the roundabout whereas the incident had occurred further 18 19 along near where the bus stop was. So there was 20 a distance between them.
- Q. So you are adding this information from Kevin Nelson to the information you already have about the location of the knife when it was found from DC Connell?
- A. Yes, and it is helping to build the picture. Because
  the knife is found here, the incident happens here, here

1 is somebody telling us: I didn't see him with anything in his hands. And of course that changes the narrative 2 3 because the initial narrative was that he had been carrying a knife when the confrontation occurred. 4 5 Then there is comment that: Q. "I could hear the male police officers shouting at 6 7 him. The only words I could make out were 'get down'." Then if we move on to page 3, again I am really just 8 taking a snapshot of some of the entries in the 9 10 statement. Paragraph 5, please, "The black male ...", 11 there we are: 12 "The black male then stepped forwards towards the 13 female officer and appeared to lunge at her with his 14 left fist towards her face/head area. I believe he 15 struck at her with his closed fists at least three times. I heard her scream out, so I cannot be positive 16 17 but I believe that at least one of these fists struck her." 18 19 Then he says: 20 "At this point I decided to go into the front garden 21 to have a closer look. I do not know why I did this 22 other than being curious. I believe it may have taken me between 10 and 20 seconds to do this. I exited my 23 house via the front door and stood looking over my 24 gate." 25

1 Then: "In this time the black male now appeared to be face 2 3 down on the pavement to the left of my house on my side 4 of the street. I could no longer get a clear view of 5 this male. There appeared to be five or six male police officers attempting to restrain him. All of these 6 7 officers were dressed in uniform. I observed one officer appeared to be kneeling on the ground with the 8 9 weight of his upper body by use of his arms to the black male's shoulder or back of neck area." 10 Do you see that? 11 12 Α. Yes. Q. "I would not be able to describe this police officer. 13 14 The other police officers appeared to be laying across 15 the black man's body." So again in terms of this statement and the 16 17 information that is contained in that, when would this have first been brought to your attention? 18 I believe early doors, because I do remember being told: 19 Α. 20 look -- and probably the next day. Because if this 21 starts at 1900, by the time they complete it and travel 22 back through, so here's two key witnesses, Ashley Wyse and Kevin Nelson. This would have been flagged up to us 23 as quickly as possible, which is probably the next day. 24 Because we are trying to build a picture of what 25

occurred in the absence of the accounts of the officers 1 2 and, therefore, it's almost like a jigsaw where you are 3 taking as much relevant information as you can and 4 trying to complete the picture. So we've got nothing from the officers? 5 Q. 6 Α. No. 7 No basic facts, initial accounts or statements of any Q. description. You've got no use of force forms 8 9 completed, no use of spray forms completed? 10 Α. Yes. And by 6 May you've got two statements from 11 Q. 12 eye witnesses. 13 Yes. Α. 14 Q. Containing the information we have looked at and you've 15 got DC Connell's statement indicating that a knife was found at a distance away? 16 17 A. Yes. 18 MS GRAHAME: I want to move on and ask you some questions 19 about that scenario, but it is quarter past 4. I wonder 20 if that would be an appropriate time? 21 LORD BRACADALE: We will continue with your evidence tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, Mr McSporran. The 22 Inquiry will adjourn. 23 24 (4.15 pm)25 (The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Friday,

1	16	February	2024)
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

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