

**INQUEST PRESS RELEASE  
WEDNESDAY 16TH NOVEMBER 2004**

**JURY RETURNS DAMNING NARRATIVE VERDICT AT JOHN HINDE  
INQUEST.**

Late on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> November the jury sitting at the inquest into the death of John Hinde returned a narrative verdict which deeply criticised the Greater Manchester Police. Mr Hinde died shortly after midnight on Friday 24<sup>th</sup> August 2001 whilst in the custody of Greater Manchester Police.

The jury were asked eight questions and their full answers are set out below.

**1) In the light of all the evidence and in particular the evidence of PC Williamson, PC Bowdell, Mr Gamble and Mr Roberts, what do you conclude was the sequence of events between Mr Hinde being removed from the Police car and him being handcuffed?**

We believe the sequence of events do not tally and are conflicting. After Mr Hinde was pulled out of the police car they fell against barrier. There was a struggle and a flailing of arms before Mr Hinde was tripped to bring him to the ground and officer fell on him. Mr Hinde may have tried to remove the bag from his own mouth before being handcuffed by both officers.

**2) In the light of all the evidence, what do you conclude the sequence of events was from being handcuffed until the ambulance arrived?**

Mr Hinde was wriggling around on the ground and thrashing of head and legs. One officer stood on his legs and pulled Mr Hinde up to restrain him from banging head at this stage officer seen part of a bag sticking out of mouth. Police tried to open mouth but couldn't. Mr Hinde went quiet. The police must have checked pulse. An ambulance was called, the Range Rover arrived and an officer said take the cuffs off. The position of Mr Hinde might have been changed. We do not believe he was in the full recovery position. (Jury's emphasis) Two officers went to do the road closure and one returned and at some point Mr Hinde died. It seems he was dead when ambulance arrived.

**3) Did Mr Hinde placing a bag in his mouth give rise to risks that were not recognised by the Police Officers?**

Yes they did not recognise there would be a risk of choking or possible drug overdose.

**4) Having heard details of the first aid training, did you consider there were any glaring omissions?**

We think four hours training is insufficient and should have periodic refresher. More training should be given for drug related first aid situations including swallowing of drugs.

5) Were there any defects in the way the first aid training was taught and if so what were they?

There needs to be sufficient assessment to increase the impact of training.

6) Did the Police Officers use their training to assess the condition of Mr Hinde?

No because they did not use DRABC

7) Was there anything from their training that the Officers should have done other than calling for an ambulance?

*Yes they should have checked for a response. There was no actual communication with Mr Hinde (jury's emphasis).*

8) Did the Officers have enough time to do anything that would have been effective to save Mr Hinde's life?

Yes we think they should have called an ambulance sooner. We think GMP policy should be changed. (Jury's emphasis) Also they should've used their training in particular to check for response.

The Coroner announced he will write to Home Secretary, Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police and the Head of the Ambulance Service to give them the jury's findings.

Helen Shaw, Co-Director of INQUEST said: "This shocking case demonstrates an appalling standard of training and practice. The jury clearly had concerns about the police version of events and are clear that the officers involved should have done more to protect Mr Hinde's life."