

was contacted nearly 24 hours after the body was found. As the body had been removed to a mortuary, there was no crime scene in place. There were also no suspects or witnesses to be dealt with. DS Turrell and I therefore agreed that my attendance would not provide any benefit, nor would it enhance the quality of the advice I could provide. I offered to attend in order to provide additional resourcing to support the investigation, but it was agreed that this was not required.

8. I should add that the decision as to whether to attend lies with the HAT. The views of the Borough do not dictate or prevent attendance, but they would be taken into consideration in the decision making process. On this occasion I did not consider HAT attendance to be necessary in order to provide advice to the Borough CID, nor did DS Turrell.
9. In order to give the Borough CID advice I reviewed:-
 - CAD 4433 20th September 2014 (IPC000453).
 - CAD 2086 28th August 2014 (IPC000027).
 - Merlin report 14 FOU008771 (IPC000032).
 - Merlin report 14 FOU008012 (IPC000028).
 - Crimint KGRT00329263 (IPC000471 is the Night Duty Occurrence Book which is the same as it was copied onto a crimint).

I do not recall viewing other documents.

10. I communicated with the DS Turrell by telephone throughout the course of the day and I also regularly spoke with DCI Lyons by telephone to update him, confirm he was satisfied with my actions and advice, and assess whether he required anything different or additional to be done.
11. When DS Turrell first contacted me, she initially wanted advice as to whether Borough CID should retain the clothing of the deceased for forensic assessment. I advised her that the clothing would be of significant forensic value. I was concerned about a number of features of the case, so I asked DS Turrell for further information and reviewed the documents set out above. Based on what I was told and what I read, concerned about the following features in particular:
 - (i) The fact that two young men had been found in the same graveyard in similar positions in a short period of time.

- (ii) Mr Whitworth was found wrapped in a bed sheet, sitting on a dining table place mat with a little bottle of liquid hanging out of his pocket and his hand down the front of his jeans. These circumstances were odd and I did consider the possibility that the scene had been staged.
 - (iii) The suicide note referred to him moving Gabriel Kovari's body. I thought there was a possibility that Mr Whitworth would not have had the physical ability to do this (this was not based on any knowledge of Mr Whitworth's strength specifically, but the strength required for anyone to moving an adult male body).
12. In the HAT advice I produced, I stated *"Based on the information available at this time it seems that this matter is a manslaughter / suicide and there is no evidence at this stage to suggest any third party involvement. However, it is necessary to investigate and establish the full facts before confirming this as the situation. To move the body of Gabriel post mortem would take some strength and Whitworth may not have been physically able to do this..."* This indicates my view that the circumstances presented themselves in a way that suggested Daniel Whitworth had unlawfully killed Gabriel Kovari (manslaughter) and later committed suicide. This hypothesis did not include the involvement of any third party in the death of Daniel Whitworth. At that stage, there was no actual evidence of third party involvement. However, based particularly on the three factors set out above, I was not satisfied that this manslaughter / suicide hypothesis should be accepted as the final answer.
13. In light of my concerns, I provided detailed advice to DS Turrell over the course of the day which is recorded in the HAT advice document, including advice on witnesses, suspects, intel, CCTV, forensics and phones.
14. In relation to forensics, I recorded that *"DCI Lyons has requested a special post mortem on Whitworth"*. It was my view that a special post mortem was necessary because of a lack of any clear evidence as to Mr Whitworth's cause of death or the circumstances leading to him being found in the cemetery. DCI Lyons agreed with this and authorised the special post mortem. This would allow a full forensic examination, maximise further forensic and investigative opportunities and determine the cause of death.
15. I discussed the issue of primacy for the investigation (i.e. whether SC&O1 should assume primacy for the investigation or whether it should remain with the local Borough CID) with DCI Lyons. I do not recall the exact details of this conversation. However, there was no

clear evidence that this was a homicide and it was not unusual in those circumstances for the local Borough to retain primacy for the investigation pending the receipt of further information or evidence that might lead to SC&O1 taking primacy. DCI Lyons and I agreed that a special post mortem was needed (as set out above) and that we would await the results of that special post mortem. We also agreed that an SC&O1 officer would attend the special post mortem. This was to provide assistance, particularly around exhibits, and in case the special post mortem revealed that this was a homicide, in which case SC&O1 would take over the investigation immediately.

16. I documented the advice I gave on a HAT report (**IPC000011**). I briefed DS Turrell over the telephone and later sent her a copy of my report via email. At the bottom of my report is a section headed "*Borough updates from work so far*". This was not written by me, but I added it in from an email which I received from DS Turrell near the end of my shift and after I had written the rest of the document. I included this section for completeness to include the update of the work done by the Borough. I retained all my emails but I understand that they have since been deleted as a result of IT upgrades and updates so I no longer have the email from DS Turrell.
17. I note that I did not record in my HAT advice document that Daniel Whitworth's clothing or the bedsheet he was found wrapped in would be of forensic value and should be submitted for forensic analysis. Whether Borough CID should retain the clothing of the deceased for forensic assessment was the reason DS Turrell contacted HAT and I advised her that it should at the outset of the phone call. I do not recall mentioning the bedsheet specifically but assumed that this would be treated in the same way as the clothing. My written advice tried to guide the Borough CID on things that they may not think about, and I thought that the death of Gabriel Kovari was important and ought to be looked at in tandem with this investigation. I did not record the need to retain Mr Whitworth's clothing or the bedsheet he was found wrapped in as I thought this was an obvious point which I had communicated over the phone, but I accept that I should have recorded it in the advice document as well. I do not know why Mr Whitworth's clothing and the bedsheet were not submitted for forensic analysis. Whether to accept advice from HAT or to follow action suggested by HAT is a matter for the Borough CID (unless MIT officers are deployed to assist a Borough CID investigation and allocated specific actions). Submitting Mr Whitworth's clothing for forensic analysis was something that I advised should be done, but it was an action to be raised completed by the Borough. HAT had no involvement in carrying out this action on their behalf.