



## **The Sheku Bayoh Public Inquiry**

### **Witness Statement**

**DC Alan Monteith**

**Taken by [REDACTED] on MS Teams on Wednesday 23 November 2022**

#### **Witness details and professional background:**

1. My full name is Alan Monteith. My date of birth is in 1964. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.
2. I am a retired Police Officer. I retired on 29 February 2020 and so have been retired for nearly three years. I was formerly a Detective Constable within the Offender Management Unit of Police Scotland.
3. I joined the police in 1990. I had completed 30 years police service at the time of my retirement in February 2020. When I joined, I was based in Stirling Police Office for two and a half years before moving to Dunblane Police Office for a year and then from Dunblane, I went onto Bridge of Allan Police Office for about five years. I then moved over to Tillicoultry and Alloa. So, I had spent approximately 15 years in response policing, which is general policing and then moved into the Crime Management Services, which is the Criminal Investigations Department (CID) and specialist units. I progressed into other

DocuSigned by:

Signature of witness.....[REDACTED].....

departments. This was in 2012, when the forces amalgamated into Police Scotland. From the CID, I then went onto the specialist unit that dealt with sexual crimes. From the special unit, I then moved to the Offender Management Unit which is the management of sex offenders in the community. My job entailed managing and monitoring sexual offenders that lived within the community, who had restrictions placed upon them. In simple terms, it was dealing with the management of sexual offenders in the community. I worked within this unit until my retirement.

**Previous Statement:**

4. I have had sight of my operational statement PS00934 which is dated 03 May 2015. I remember preparing this statement although I don't fully remember its content. I am asked which account should be more accurate and relied upon, my recollection today or my operational statement. I think the operational statement would be more accurate and should be relied upon.

**Kirkcaldy Police Station- 03 May 2015**

5. On the 3 May 2015 I was working 0800 to 1600 hours in Larbert Police Office. I was contacted by Superintendent [REDACTED]. He was the on-call Superintendent for our area. He also contacted police officer, David Bellingham, who I was to be partnered with that day. Superintendent [REDACTED] explained that there had been an incident that had happened in Kirkcaldy and that there were looking for people to assist in the investigation. I was asked to make my way to Kirkcaldy, where an explanation would be provided on what was required or what would be needed.
6. On arrival at Kirkcaldy, we were met by a member of the Major Investigation Team (MIT). I am asked if I can remember who was in charge of the investigation when I arrived at Kirkcaldy. The answer is no. I don't recall who

DocuSigned by:

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED] .....

was in charge of the Major Investigations team. I've never worked in Kirkcaldy; we must have met someone that took us to where we were supposed to be going and that's all that I can remember.

7. We attended an initial briefing provided by DS Graeme Dursley. I am asked to elaborate on the content of the briefing to the best of my memory and whether I was told what the source of the information was for DS Dursley. I wouldn't be aware of the source of the information. The name DS Dursley, I am only reminded of because of my statement. It was a general briefing because I would imagine at that time some of the circumstances wouldn't have been confirmed, so they would be initially going on what information would have been available to them at the time, which he obviously passed onto us.
8. I am asked if there is a process of confirming that information and where that kind of informing comes from. The answer is no, I am not aware of a process. The incident obviously happened quite early on. By the time we got there it would have been a good few hours after it. So, the initial circumstances from initial police calls made by the public, or by officer's present or the people in charge of the initial incident, would have been forwarded to the MIT Team.
9. I am asked if I recall being told by anybody other than DS Dursley anything about Sheku Bayoh's interaction with the police on that morning. Not really, no is the answer. When myself and DC Bellingham initially attended at Kirkcaldy, we were making our way through the building which included the canteen, which I think was the area that most of the officers that were involved in the incidents were, although I didn't know it at the time. There was one officer, as far as I am aware that is not involved that I did know because I worked with him previously at Tillicoultry and that was Constable Mark Hay. You'll see that his name appears in my Notebook entry. We just had a general chat and he mentioned that there was cover needed because there wasn't

Signature of witness.....

DocuSigned by:





anyone else left to cover the calls. We didn't discuss anything about the incident itself.

10. I am asked if I remember being involved in or overhearing any general discussion amongst colleagues in the office about the incident that morning. There wasn't anything that specifically stood out in relation to the incident. There was the general kind of details about a male being seen in the street with a knife, and then a struggle between him and the police and as a result of that Mr Bayoh obviously had passed away but other than that there was nothing really that sticks out.

**Locus Protection:** Dick/Macleod Home Address

11. DC Bellingham and I along with other MIT Officers made our way to Dick/Macleod Home Address. I think the information was that Mr Bayoh had been at that address the previous night, which makes it part of the investigation. It was a possible crime scene.

12. I have been referred to the third paragraph on page two of my statement PS00934, which starts, *"As Part of the initial briefing, along with officers from the MIT East, we were tasked with tracing Martyn Dick and his partner, Kirsty. Information was later provided that the address of Martyn Dick was that of Dick/Macleod Home Address"*. I am asked if I remember who provided this information. The answer is no. From memory, myself and DC Bellingham weren't from the area, we were assisting officers from MIT or the local officers who knew where they were going. I think we had gone to maybe one or two addresses that weren't relevant. As I'm not from Kirkcaldy, I wouldn't have had access to their databases. This kind of local information could have come from a crime file system, which is used to check for previous or known addresses of people who have had contact with the police before. We just

Signature of witness..... DocuSigned by: [Redacted Signature] .....

followed on from the information that was passed to the MIT team and followed them to this address at Dick/Macleod Home Address in Kirkcaldy.

13. I have been referred to the first paragraph on page three of my statement PS00934, which starts, *"The nature of the police enquiry was explained to them. Due to the nature of the enquiry, they were requested to attend Kirkcaldy Police Office to provide the relevant statements which they agreed to do"*. I am asked, If I recall, what was said or explained to Martyn and Kirsty about the nature of the matter being investigated. My recollection would be that it wouldn't have been myself or DC Bellingham that spoke with them. It would have been officers from the MIT team who arrived just as we did, who were probably tasked with obtaining the relevant statements and information from them. They would have knocked on the door and explained who they are. I think it would have been general information that would have been passed, similar to what I would have received at the briefing. I can't recall if they were already aware of the outcome of the incident or not but the impression, I got was that they were already kind of aware of some of the circumstances.

14. I am asked if I spent much time with the other officers and Kirsty and Martyn. No, we didn't spend a great amount of time at their address. My recollection is that we turned up, they were traced and spoken to by the MIT team and then because of the request to provide details of the circumstances and their involved, they were requested to provide statements. It is a lot easier for statements to be carried out at the police office, so they were asked to attend the police office to provide their statements. They would have spoken with other officers, as myself and DC Bellingham were tasked with securing the premises. We didn't spend a great deal of time at this address, we got the keys and secured the premises and then left ourselves. This was at the same time that the MIT team and the witnesses Kirsty and Martyn also left.

Signature of witness.....DocuSigned by: [Redacted].....



15. I am asked, if I recall, who it was that authorised the search and seizure of the property. In relation to your question, I would say the property wasn't searched or seized at that time, but it was locked and secured. The request could have come from a member of the MIT team in relation to possible future search in connection with the ongoing incident. The initial securing of the property would have been with the consent of the occupiers.
16. I am asked what my understanding of the basis on which Dick/Macleod  
Home Address was being seized and searched and what we were expecting to find through this exercise. I believe that would have been in relation to drugs or property connected with the incident. From the briefing and from the information that came from the public was that Mr Bayoh may have been under the influence of alcohol or drugs and again, the information that he had spent some time with his friends at that address. I think he had been watching the boxing the night before. There wasn't really any search, and the only seizure was taking control of the premises as a potential crime scene which was just initially to make sure that the premises were secured and looked after, as in protected. From my previous experience, which would have been to allow the relevant inquiries to be made in relation to either obtaining warrants or permission needed to do anything with the property at a later date or a later time.
17. I have been asked to explain the normal procedure for securing a property and carrying out as search. It's locking up the property and making sure that it's secure. From my previous experience, I would do an initial check to the premises to make sure that it's secure as in that there's no insecure doors or windows. You would also check the premises to ensure that there's no one else or animals within it from a health and safety and welfare point of view. You wouldn't do anything else without obtaining the relevant authority. The exception being, for example if it was in relation to drugs and there was a big pile of drugs on a table in the middle of the living room, then you may seize that at that opportunity or you would take a mental note and write it down.

DocuSigned by:  
[Redacted Signature]

Signature of witness.....[Redacted Signature].....

18. I am asked to explain the process for securing a warrant; if we needed a warrant to secure the premises and if we needed the consent of Kirsty and Martyn. You wouldn't need a warrant if you've obtained the informed consent of the occupier. In relation to the ongoing investigation, it would be best practice to obtain a warrant for either drugs or property. When we spoke with Kirsty, she was happy for us to secure the property. She provided a set of keys for the premises so that we could lock up. I also took her details and her phone number so that we could get in touch with her later on to return her keys if it's not required. As it relates to the process, you would generally secure the premises and then someone would apply to the Procurator Fiscal for a warrant to search the premises.

19. I have been shown Kirst Macleod's statement PIRC-00054 and referred to the last paragraph on page 2 which starts:

*"The CID didn't ask permission to do anything but neither Martyn or me really challenged them about it. We just did what they asked us to do. They did not explain why they were taking control of our house or what they were going to do with it. Again, neither Martyn or me asked them any of these questions either".*

I am asked how I would interpret this paragraph in terms of what was explained to both Kirsty and Martyn and whether consent was obtained. I'm not sure. DC Bellingham and I wouldn't have directly spoken with them in relation to this process. It's my understanding that they agreed to provide statements, or to speak to the police and as part of that which would have included securing the premises, so that's when she provided the keys. I'm unsure as to how well Kirsty and Martyn are aware of the police process. In those circumstances, they've either just found out that their friend's passed away or it's relatively early in the morning and they've been up all night, then I

Signature of witness..........



can't comment on what their train of thought would be. When people are meeting the police, they've been asked questions or being asked questions about certain circumstances, so at that time they probably wouldn't think to ask. I would be surprised if they were aware at that time enough to ask the relevant questions in relation to what you are doing, why are you doing it, why are we going or why do we need to go. Initially I would imagine, they probably want to help with whatever is going on.

20. I have been referred back to the paragraph two on page three of my statement PS00934, which states, *"At this time myself an Police witness Bellingham spoke briefly with Kirsty Macleod and explained that their property would be secured the previous night"*. I am asked if I recall, why that conversation was only had with Kirsty and not with Martyn? No, I don't recall. I don't know if Martyn was speaking to someone else at the time, I don't know if it's Kirsty's address or not.

21. I have been referred to paragraph one on page three of my statement PS00934, which starts, *"Due to the nature of the enquiry they were requested to attend Kirkcaldy Police Office to provide the relevant statements which they agreed to do"*. I am asked what was the reason for obtaining their statements. It would have been because of their initial involvement in their connection with Mr Bayoh. The information was that he'd been at a friend's house watching the boxing with other people who were to be traced and spoken to in relation to their involvement. This is all background information and circumstances that give you the bigger picture of what's went on. My understanding is that the initial contact would have been from members of the public phoning in about a male in the street in the early hours but you don't know what's gone on beforehand, so that's part of your investigation and your inquiries to find out the circumstances of why he was basically where he was. Martyn or Kirsty may provide an explanation of what's went on and why he ended up where he was. It's not best practice for statements to be taken in people's home if it's

DocuSigned by:   
Signature of witness..........



considered a possible crime scene. A neutral environment is preferred where you can provide either food or tea or coffee, or somewhere to sit down and somewhere to take a proper statement. That will be the main reason for them to go to Kirkcaldy Police Office.

22. In relation to the involvement of possible drugs, I am asked to clarify where this information would have come from and what kind of drugs were being looked into. It would have been general information because of the nature of the information that came in, in relation to Mr Bayoh and his initial actions. I think it was to do with Mr Bayoh standing in the middle of the road in possession of a knife. I don't know if he was trying to stop cars but that isn't the actions you would normally expect from someone, so they've either got to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs or someone experiencing a mental episode in relation to that. So, this is why I think they maybe have thought there may have been drugs involved to start with. I don't know if there had been any other information coming from somewhere else. The other thing that springs to mind is that, I don't think Kirsty and Martyn were the **only** people that were watching the boxing at that address. There were other ongoing enquiries to trace other people. I think there was another male there but I don't know his name but that's the **only** thing that kind of springs to mind, that there was another person that was- they were trying to trace. I think he was an Asian male. Going back to your earlier question about information that I may have heard or may have recalled, the only thing that I can recall was that I think this other person may have been contacted by phone and wasn't willing to either tell them where he was at the time or willing to speak with them to the police.

23. I am asked if we were trying to trace the aforementioned male because he was suspected of being involved in anything to do with the drugs or if it was to trace this person to ascertain further information about Sheku Bayoh being under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Yes, it would have been in relation to

DocuSigned by:  
Signature of witness..........

his involvement with Mr Bayoh. You're unable to do an investigation without tracing people that you know were there or thereabouts during the circumstances. You can't exclude someone because you can't trace them. Everyone has a different take on the whole set of circumstances so you've got to find out what they would be speaking to and what they're willing to tell you. The overriding factor is that if someone has passed away then the involvement of drugs, or their involvement in drugs might not necessarily seem as important as other things. There were other ongoing enquiries to trace other people. Anyone that phoned in would have to be traced to speak to their recollection as they're all potential witnesses to everything. However, you're trying to find out what happened before those initial calls came in. If they'd been watching the boxing which was a very big fight then they've probably been up all night. I can't comment in relation to Mr Bayoh or anyone else's for that matter, recreational or habitual drug taking or their alcohol dependency or non-dependency. All of this would come out in statements. I would have imagined there would have been things to chase up and find out what the circumstances was when he left, where he was going, who he was supposed to be with, and why he was going out. General questions like that to take the circumstances in the background.

24. I am asked if it is normal to proceed on the premise that someone presenting as Sheku Bayoh did, could have been experiencing a mental episode. You don't really know until you meet the person. I wasn't involved in any contact with Mr Bayoh so I don't know how people would perceive the presenting circumstances at that particular time. It's down to the individual as it's a judgment call when you get there and how you deal with people. You don't really know until you're faced with that situation but it's always in the back of your mind, why do people act the way they act? There's got to be a reason for it. Some people are just generally aggressive towards other people, for no particular reason. But then again, could you say that was a mental episode or could you say it's because they're under the influence of drugs or alcohol. I

Signature of witness..........



don't know. You have to be in that situation to make that call. There was no great deal of details that came through. The information that came across was there was a man in the street, trying to stop cars and he's got a knife, then that's where you'll get an indicator of something that's not quite right.

25. I have been shown Kirst Macleod's statement PIRC-00054 and referred to the paragraph two on page 3 which starts:

*"At this time I was still wearing the clothes I had on when Shek was in the house. I asked if I could go and get changed and before I went upstairs they told me to leave out the clothes I had been wearing. They explained this by saying they might have to rule out my DNA from Shek as I had earlier told them that I had cuddled Shek when he arrived at the house that morning".*

I am asked what my understanding was of the basis for this and what was Kirsty being ruled out of. I don't recall her being asked to change out of her clothing. However, looking at her statement and what she has said, in general terms, you're looking at the potential for forensic evidence, anything at all. DNA is a part of this and it is used as a way of ruling in evidence or ruling out evidence. In relation to Mr Bayoh, after his death, then all of his clothing and possession would have been retained. Because it was widely reported in the press, you're looking at any interaction between Mr Bayoh and the police and if you can say it belongs to Kirsty then you know that she's come in contact with Mr Bayoh, so then it's not a third party, unknown person.

26. I am asked if I recall seeing anyone in scene of crime protective gear. The answer is no. There wouldn't have been at that point. If Kirsty has been asked to change her clothing and there wouldn't be any connection between anybody in the house or between any police officers there as she's done that herself. So there's no need for anybody to be in forensic suits at that point.

Signature of witness..........



## Notebook

27. I have been directed to page 094 of my notebook (PS18486) and the entries related to Sunday 03 May 2015. I am asked what the entry '*Mark Hay*' relates to. As I have explained earlier, Mark Hay was the only one I knew from when I'd work previously and I didn't know he had transferred over to Kirkcaldy and Dunfermline. When I bumped into him, I spoke with him, but I didn't know at that point if he was involved in it or not. If it became clear later that he was involved in it, then I'd probably have to declare that I knew him. It's best practice to make it known that you do know someone personally or if you've worked with them before, so there's no indication of any kind of bias.

## Return to Kirkcaldy Police Station and Obtaining Police Equipment

28. I have been referred to paragraph one on page three of my statement PS00934, it starts,

*"Along with Police witness Bellingham I returned to Kirkcaldy Police Office. About 1500hrs same date myself and Police witness Bellingham were given a briefing by DCI Stuart Huston. The Briefing took place within room 2.2.4 within Kirkcaldy Police Office and was in relation to the retention of clothing, CS Spray or Pava Spray and items of officer safety equipment from police officers involved in the incident".*

I am asked if I recall any of the details of the contents of that briefing by DCI Stuart Houston. I recall all that was there. My recollection of DCI Stuart Houston is that he was in charge of the MIT team inquiry. He was very specific in relation to the forensic side of things to minimise cross contamination and to retain the relevant bits and pieces. I'm assuming room 2.2.4 had been identified because it would not have been used by anyone else as you're looking for forensic side of things to lessen any kind of cross

Signature of witness..........

contamination because what you don't want is somebody to go later on and say, 'Well that's the room that I usually work in'. It could have also been identified for the privacy aspect of it as you need a room that is not open to anything else and with a closed door for privacy reasons. This goes back to your question in relation to the retention of clothing from Kirsty. This is basically the same. You're taking an opportunity to retain the clothing that people were wearing at the time for any forensic opportunities.

29. Paragraph 4 page 3 of my statement PS00934 then goes onto say,

*"In order to retain the forensic integrity of the process and minimise the potential for cross contamination if was requested that both myself and police witness Bellingham would wear Scene of Crime protective suits and gloves which would be changed after each officer had removed or handed over their relevant clothing and equipment. In addition, this was to be carried out on a debris collection sheet which was also to be retained along with our Scene of Crime protective suits after each officer".*

Both myself and Dc Bellingham were suited up in relation to that, with gloves. I don't think there was any reason to change between each item because that would have been far too many suits and gloves which could cause cross contamination. A debris collection sheet was used. DC Bellingham and I wore protective suits and had officers take off their individual items whilst standing on a very large brown bag that was opened up. The debris collected on that sheet was then kept. The briefing was for the officers to come one at a time and we were going to go through them, retaining their clothing, officer safety equipment before putting them into production bags. There were then handed to the MIT team, the productions officer. All items taken from the officers were logged on the officer clothing retention forms. I can't remember if they were individual forms for each individual officer or if it was just a continuous sheet for every officer. I would say it would be normal practice for it to be a

Signature of witness..........



continuation sheet. It would be completed as you went along starting with officer Craig Walker. Basically, when we've had our briefing and he's presented at the room at that time and we've retained all that we were asked to retain, the label number is part of the production. That 'AM' of 'AM001' is my initial. The '001' would have been the first production that I would have taken. You can see that they're all sequential and they're all my initials. So, for argument's sake if another office had stuff taken from them, for example DC Bellingham who had the production from an officer and it's been labelled "left boot, right boots, trouser, belt". If they've put that for Craig Walker, how can I differentiate that between the next person if I've put down "left boots, right boots"? DC Bellingham would have to put down "DB" as his initials. The identifier is usually the initials plus a middle name. It changes between scene of crime policies whether you down in "001" or "1". If someone was to show me a left boot at a late date in their court case or an inquiry, I would look at the production label, see "AM001 left boot, PC Craig Walker" that I can identify as the boot that I took from Craig Walker. This is the standard process for anybody that's been involved in major incidents such as assaults, sexual assaults, murders etc. It's good practice to put in your identifiers.

30. I have been referred to page seven of my statement PS00934 as it relates to the retention of PC Alan Paton's equipment, it states " *Police Constable 694 Alan Paton commented that he had lost his baton at the locus of the incident*" and at page 7 as it relates to the retention of PC Ashley Tomlinson's equipment, where it states, " *Police Constable 691 Ashley Tomlinson commented that he had lost his handcuffs and baton at the scene of the incident*". I am asked if any efforts were made to locate the equipment by the officers, said to have been lost. I would expect someone to have been tasked with that or it would already have been done. PC Walker was the first officer that I spoke with, and I remember that he didn't have his baton, it was in his locker. He had to go back and get it, but he didn't have it with him at the time of the incident and it hadn't left his locker prior to handing it over. So, this

Signature of witness.....



.....



instance with PC Walker, and the fact that the two officers, as in Paton and Tomlinson, had said that they had lost their handcuffs and their batons at the scene, which would have been passed on either at the time or when my statement would have been submitted, that would have been picked up.

## Post Involvement and Media

31. I am asked if I have been involved in the investigations since 03 May 2015.

The answer is no; however, I was contacted by [REDACTED] It was at the start of the public inquiry. I was contacted to say that because of the nature of the inquiry, anything to do with the police would be forwarded to the inquiry. This resulted in you speaking to me and wanting personal contact through [REDACTED].

32. I am asked if I have been following the inquiry and if so, what I have seen or heard. I wouldn't say that I've been following the inquiry. I have seen stuff on the media as in the TV. In particular I did watch the programme from the other night, which I thought was a bit coincidental. Unless it's been in the news, such as ongoing reports in relation to how the inquiry's been progressing and who's been involved. I've had very limited involvement, if you like. However, I was in the initial stages, so it does stick in your mind that that's a relevant inquiry, but I haven't been following it or researching it.

33. I am asked if I have spoken with anyone from the press or the media about the incident, my involvement in the incident at the time or up until this point. The answer is no, never.

34. I am asked if I know anyone else, who has spoken with the press. The answer is no. The only people that I would know that had been involved was DC Bellingham. I was in a different office from DC Bellingham, so we didn't work that closely together or we didn't work together often. He then got promoted

Signature of witness.....  
 DocuSigned by: [REDACTED]

and moved away from the Criminal Investigations Department. You don't come into contact with these people all the time, so that's the only person who I'd have any kind of commonality. I may have mentioned to other people in the past as they tend to ask you what you did on that day. That's because you weren't doing what you were supposed to be doing, so you weren't doing your normal job.

35. I am asked if I'm aware of any Police Scotland Standard Operating Procedure or Guidance on the subject of dealing with the media or press. The answer is yes, in general terms you wouldn't speak with the press. You'd advise them to go through a media officer who deals with media releases about inquiries and investigation. However, if you're a Senior Investigating Officer, then it would be part of your remit to possibly speak with the press in relation to either press releases or information. As you can imagine the police have to speak with the press in order to obtain information, especially if you're looking for people to come forward as witnesses. In relation to your question, am I aware of protocols? Yes, I'm aware that there are protocols. Am I aware what the extent of the protocols are? Probably not, other than you would direct press inquiries to the media officer or senior officer.

## Training

36. I am asked what training I had received prior to 03 May 2015 that related to the role that I carried out on that day, for example, securing the property, seizing the property, recovering items etc. I had general experience, although I have done basic production courses, I have done a Home Office Large Major Enquiry System (HOLMES) production officer's course. I was a crime scene manager through a training course at the police college and I have been part of a several major investigations in relation to productions and inquiries. I can't remember how long the course was, it was possible a week where they go through different aspects of crime scene management in

Signature of witness..........



relation to the recovery of items, preservation of scenes and common approach paths. In the police, you generally pick up a lot of things by experience and being involved provides part of your training, as every day is a school day as they say; you're always learning. You pick up things from other people that have done it before you, and what you think are best practices. I have been involved as a production officer on several major inquiries. When you go from being a uniformed officer to a specialist department, for example when I went into CID, you're dealing with more serious aspects of crime and what the police are involved in, and as part of that you undertake in-house training which provides a general introduction into productions by people that have done that role before. In addition, I have had the HOLMES production course related to how to deal with the HOLMES system and how to put them on the system as its computer based that covers the whole of the country. HOLMES is a computer generated Home Office investigation system relating to the collation of statements.

37. I am asked what training I have had on the use of force or if I had any training on incapacitating sprays, use of batons and leg restraints. You usually go through a yearly assessment and training course in relation to the use of batons, use of handcuffs and various techniques. This training was held yearly and then stopped and changed to every two years before going back to yearly training. The reason they did it yearly was because you needed recertification in relation to your use of the CS Spray or PAVA. Every year we would get recertification in relation to the use of spray, batons and legal restraints and also various bits and pieces. It's in the form of a one- or two-day course. It would be either put into training or taken out of training depending on what the result of the last year's incidents had been. The training was to recertify that you're still competent enough in relation to various techniques that you would use and do. I would say that the more that people did those techniques, then the more proficient they would become. There are instances where you have to restrain people for various reasons. In

Signature of witness.....

DocuSigned by:



my role, the use of restraint was less than what you would expect in an uniformed officer's role as we came in after the aftermath of incidents. With my role in the Offender Manager Unit, you're dealing with people in the community that you might not necessarily want to highlight to other people. Because you're dealing with vulnerable people that are at risk from other people you tried to be as anonymous as possible.

38. I am asked if I recall ever being given training on de-escalating situations using communication or other means. The answer is yes. This is part of your officer safety training. It's the contacting cover aspect of the training. It is part of your training to go in and speak with people and try to de-escalate things whilst finding out why people are acting the way they're acting as it goes back to initial response in any kind of incident. This was part of our yearly training as its scenario based.
39. The training would go through what the current training aspects were in relation to the use of handcuffs, whether it should be to the front or the back; the use of batons; how you should use them or not use them; and the areas that you can strike people with it. As part of the training there would be scenario-based situations so you would be paired up with somebody, or you'd be in a team of three or four. In the scenario, you would put someone in a police cell, do their restraints and try to get people in and out of cells, if they've been kicking off. There are very dangerous situations when you have someone that's kicking off and you have to try and get yourself out of a police cell. The role-playing aspects gives you a blank situation to let you deal with it.
40. I am asked if I recall any training being given on excited delirium, which is also referred to as acute behavioural disorder or drug induced psychosis. The answer is yes. It's basic training on how people present and what may or may not be wrong with them. I think this training has progressed over the years

Signature of witness.....

DocuSigned by:



and has been mentioned more. I imagine this training would have been in place before the incident in May 2015.

41. I am asked if I recall any training being given on the subject of identifying medical emergencies for example, someone going through a mental episode. The answer is yes. In relation to mental episodes, certain behaviours or traits are obvious and other mental episodes are not. Your training consists of an awareness of certain mental health conditions in order to deal with these situations. In addition, the medical emergency side of things was probably more to do with people with either heart attacks, respiratory issues or strokes. It's part of your officer safety training, that you would have to do some form of refresher in relation to the likes of CPR, mouth to mouth stuff and possibly identifying the signs and how you'd approach people in those circumstances.

42. I am asked if I recall ever being given training on post incident management process that would be followed in relation to a death in custody or investigations of deaths in custody. The answer is yes. There is the Trauma Risk Management (TRIM) process. It's an acronym but I can't recall what it stands for. It relates to the dealing with aftermath of incidents that you're involved with, and it's offered to police officers. It's been offered on a few occasions.

43. I am asked if I was given any training in relation to post incident management of deaths in custody, or investigation of deaths in custody. There may have been some form of input at some point, but I can't remember anything specific. This isn't an area of business that I would necessarily be involved in.

44. I am asked if I recall receiving any training being given on the subject of racial awareness or equality and diversity. The answer is yes. It's been on several occasions throughout the years, but I can't recall the specifics of it. I imagine this training would have been in place prior to the incident in May 2015. I am

Signature of witness..........



asked if I remember anything about this training or if anything stood out or if was it while back. It's a while back. In general terms, you go by your own thoughts, so I think it's more of having an awareness. To be made aware that nobody's the same as you. People have different beliefs, ethnic background, different cultures and ways of doing things. I think it was along those lines.

45. I am asked if I recall any training relating to liaising with the next of kin or delivering a death message. It would have been part of the detective's training. I can't remember any specifics but going back to general terms and major incidents, there would be someone allocated to do that role, family liaisons officers. They are specifically trained in that aspects of dealing with families of people that are deceased, whether it's been in custody or otherwise. Again, this isn't something I would have particularly been involved in, although I have delivered death messages before. I would have had general training for this but it's specific role. The family liaisons should be the people dealing with this, especially if it's at an early stage of a major incident and that's something that's got to be done. If it's not done straightaway because there's not an availability for one, then you just have to again, deal with the situation as best as you can when you're in that situation. It's not the easiest thing to do, put it that way. If they are available, they are put in place. Although you are trained in these things within the police, the availability may not necessary be instantaneous and you may have to pull someone from other department or some other resource or if it's a weekend get them in from wherever they are to do whatever they have to do. Specifically in relation to your public inquiry, I would expect that there would have been a family liaison officer of some sort deployed at an early stage to the family.

Signature of witness.....

DocuSigned by:





## Race

46. I am asked if in my career with police, I have ever witnessed any examples of racial discrimination by police officers or staff. For example, any racist jokes or comments. That's a hard one to say. Probably in hindsight but not specifically. There's nothing specific that's sticking out in my mind. There may have been a few derogatory comments of some sort passed by people in general or specific terms to whatever they were dealing with or whoever they were dealing with but there's nothing that springs to mind that I can definitely say.

47. I am asked if I were to observe any racist incident, specifically a direct incident, how would I have responded. You'd either pull the person up about it yourself or tell someone else about it. Initially, you'd think you have to have words with people. Because of my length of service which has been approximately 30 years in the police, I would definitely say that throughout the 30 years things have progressed in so much that there's also a lot more awareness, a lot more training and a lot more emphasis placed on the unacceptability of certain behaviours. Not just in relation to race but in relation to any other kind of prejudices that people or preconceived ideas that people may have. There is a lot more openness now about all aspects of life. It just happens to be within the police umbrella, if you like, as well. There's the LGBTQ+ aspect of it as well. That's not so well publicised but it's not a taboo subject anymore. It's not something that people have to be frightened of. It's the same for race as well. It doesn't enter into the way that I think or react. You are aware that there are more groups, more awareness, more publicity and more interaction of those aspects now.

48. I am asked to clarify what I meant when I said that I would pull someone up who has said something racist, if I would say that wasn't correct. The answer is yes. I would say that's not right. You can't say that or that's not appropriate or that's not fair because you don't know the person. I don't recall any specific

DocuSigned by:

Signature of witness..........

incidents. It's just generalisations that people make about people because of what either they see, hear or think they see or think they hear. There is a process in place for reporting these incidents, which makes it a lot easier for it to be reported.

49. I am asked what formal process is in place to report these incidents. There is a process in place which can be reported anonymously if required. I'm not a 100% sure in relation to how you'd report or what forms you'd have to fill out or who you'd want to speak to. I do know that you'd speak to your line manager, and they would pass it on or again, you could report it anonymously or directly to the complaints department. Everything in the police is now recorded or it should be recorded, if you have any complaints. Then it's up to the line manager if you'd like to deal with that and to see where it goes. It's now a lot easier to make complaints as required because of the processes in place to somebody reporting incidents. I feel it is easier for somebody to say you shouldn't be doing that or I don't agree with that. So, I think those processes are now in place, and I think that people are more able or willing to voice their disagreement with someone on their perceived thoughts or actions.

50. I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that this statement may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website.

Date..... January 27, 2023 | 9:35 AM GMT  
Signature of witness.....

DocuSigned by:

[Redacted Signature]

02840E9F7DAA4E0...