

**Whether you considered it was necessary to identify the person who was with DW prior to his death (according to the note) as this is not covered in the HAT advice. If not, why not? Do you think it is likely that submission of sex swabs would have been authorised for that purpose, if a request had been made?**

17. I do not recall six years later what my thought processes were. From my review of the limited documents made available to me, the suicide note mentions 'the guy I was with last night'. I do not think that this individual was considered a suspect by anyone at the time. This was not considered a murder case or allocated to me. It was considered by some as a possible suicide and others as unexplained.
18. As this investigation was not considered a murder at the time, I do not think sex swabs would have been authorised.
19. In this case, I do not think a forensic manager would authorise such a submission. Laboratories are a finite resource and process many thousands of cases so overloading their workload would lead to a breakdown of a service running at full capacity. Typically, for a newly allocated unsolved murder case, the investigation would generate hundreds of exhibits. A forensic strategy meeting would take place with the CSM and the maximum submissions would be limited to six. Exhibits could still be retained and submitted at a later stage when new information comes to light and a rationale or justification exists for submitting the items.
20. There were other ways in which the person who was with Daniel could have been identified that do not include the forensic submissions to a laboratory. These could include telephone data, CCTV, social media enquiries, witness accounts, telephone cell site data and house to house enquiries. These enquiries would seek to identify this person and generate far more information.
21. Telephone and CCTV enquiries, along with witnesses, social media, and house to house enquiries were included in the advice in the HAT return.

**Whether you would have expected the Borough to return to SCD for advice following receipt of the post mortem in April 2015 (as a matter of generality following HAT input or specifically in this case in light of Dr Swift's conclusions).**

22. As a matter of generality, I would not expect a Borough to return to SCD for advice. I do not recall an MPS policy requiring this. A Borough has a management structure which are capable of making decisions.
23. However, I would expect a Borough to return to SCD if there was further information or there has been a development which required the support or advice of SCD.

**Signature**