

appropriately. The failure to call out the DI or DCI when it was realised how serious the assault on Robert Hamill was is in my view evidence of how the incident was being taken lightly.

10. Best practice in the event of serious crime is for the senior CID officer to be called out and for him or her to be party to the debrief of all officers who attended that scene and had anything of evidential value to contribute. Depending on the expertise of the senior uniform officer present then the senior CID officer will either lead on that debrief or take the appropriate notes in order to progress the investigation.
11. In this case I believe DCI **P39** should have been called out immediately upon realisation that this assault had resulted in a serious head injury to Robert Hamill. If that had occurred then she could have either led the debriefing or at least been present. The debriefing could have led to the identification of suspects leading to the arrest strategy. I do accept that at the end of a busy shift the RUC were not physically capable of conducting instant multiple arrests. However the purpose and benefit of having a senior CID officer lead on the investigation from the earliest opportunity is he or she has the authority to summon as many staff on duty as are required to diligently follow up on arrests and forensic recovery.
12. In this case this did not occur and in my opinion the enquiry was allowed to drift without real direction. That is not intended to imply criticism of the constables engaged on the investigation but is aimed at Inspector McCrum and DCI **P39**.

6.31 It is to be noted that following a thematic inspection by the HMIC (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary) of the PSNI in 2002/2003 (Appendix 30) (45230 – 45231) on the investigation of murder they observed

*“HMIC found evidence of uniformed duty inspectors taking limited responsibility at scenes and being content to leave CID in charge of the scene with uniformed constables to continue the scene log. This lack of direction has led to unmanaged scene entry and inconsistent log completion. These circumstances offer opportunities for the integrity of the scene to be challenged.”*

6.32 Police Sergeant **P89** provided 3 statements.

The first is dated 7<sup>th</sup> May 1997, (Appendix 31 (9213 – 9214), the second is dated 15<sup>th</sup> May 1997, (Appendix 32) (9215 – 9216) and the third is dated 28<sup>th</sup> December 2000, (Appendix 33) (11084 – 11085).

6.33 The first statement was almost a copy of Inspector McCrum's. It was one page in length and provided no detail. I make the same observation as I did with Inspector McCrum; the statement was so vague and lacking in detail that it was evidentially worthless.