

Southport Inquiry

Witness Name: Skott Aide Morgan

Exhibits: N/A

Dated: 27th August 2025

THE SOUTHPORT INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF SKOTT AIDE MORGAN

I, Skott Aide Morgan, will say as follows: -

INTRODUCTION

1. I am Skott Aide Morgan, and I am a Social Worker at Halton Borough Council, based at Runcorn Town Hall.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Southport Inquiry (the "Inquiry") with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 6th August 2025.

BACKGROUND

3. My qualifications include a BA Hons in Social Work from Manchester Metropolitan University. I graduated in 2016 with a 2:1. I have 9 years' experience working with children and families across the sector.
4. I began working for Sefton Specialist CAMHS in November 2019, I left in March 2020. I was employed via an agency as a Senior Mental Health Practitioner. I have had several roles since including Halton CAMHS, Liverpool Early Help, Cheshire East Council as a Looked after children's social worker, CBT pilot scheme social

Southport Inquiry

Worker, Wirral Council as a Duty and Assessment Social Worker and a Help Line Team Manager for Hourglass Safer Ageing. I have also been an approved foster carer for Liverpool City Council since October 2024.

5. As a Senior Mental Health Practitioner, I was responsible for assessing, reviewing, and providing one-to-one therapeutic support to young people experiencing mental health difficulties. I held a caseload of individuals with varying levels of need, conducted comprehensive mental health assessments, and developed tailored care plans. My role also involved screening referrals to determine service suitability, undertaking duty tasks including crisis response, and collaborating with multi-agency professionals to ensure coordinated care. I worked closely with families, schools, and safeguarding teams to promote the emotional wellbeing and safety of the young people under my care.
6. I have completed this statement from my own knowledge and following a review of AR's records.

Narrative of involvement

7. I first became involved with AR in December 2019 when I was allocated to him as his CAMHS Case Manager.

17 December 2019

8. On 17th December 2019 I attended a strategy meeting in the morning with the following agencies:
 - Police;
 - Education;
 - Social Care;
 - PREVENT;
 - Health; and

Southport Inquiry

- Police Mental Health Services.
9. In my notes of the meeting, I have recorded that the Police explained that AR had been arrested for carrying a dangerous weapon: a knife and a baseball bat (although this was in fact a hockey stick), which he had modified to have a better grip. The Police noted that AR attacked [DPA]; however, his intention was to attack [DPA] who had previously bullied him. The Police reported that AR had stated that he had no intention to use the knife.
 10. The Police went on to update that AR had been viewing inappropriate content online in relation to terrorism. AR had aggressively denied he did this to the Police and laughed throughout the interview. AR's Dad was there on the first day and his Mum on the second day. AR's Mum did not challenge his behaviour, was very quiet and disclosed that she had been hiding knives so that AR could not use them.
 11. The Police noted that they had seized computers and phones and that the Custody Sergeants had struggled to contact Dad and there was reluctance to engage. AR had spoken to Childline and told them he had taken a knife into school on ten separate occasions. Childline then spoke to the Police. The Police stated that a provisional Forensic CAMHS (FCAMHS) appointment had been arranged for 21st January. This service becomes involved when a child or young person is at risk of offending or is offending due to their mental health. This service is provided by Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust.
 12. The Range High School updated that there were no SEN concerns for AR after a Round Robin communication. The school explained that AR wanted to stab [DPA] [DPA] and that he had no idea of being arrested or consequences of this. The school noted that they had placed AR on the Autism Spectrum Condition assessment ("ASC") waitlist. The school stated that AR thought he had Attention Deficit Disorder ("ADD") after undertaking his own research.
 13. Acorns School stated that AR's Mum and Dad were emotionless. Acorns made reference to AR searching school shootings in America. Acorns updated that AR was focussed on one boy bullying him but that there was no evidence of this. AR's Dad was adamant that the boy was picking on AR. Acorns noted that they were checking AR for any "sharps" and that he was being checked by a metal detector.

Southport Inquiry

14. Acorns noted that AR had no eye contact with anyone, and although he was saying that boys were picking on him, they were trying to befriend him. Acorns took AR to Chester Zoo on 27th November and reported that it was the only day where AR was happy and had “*normal*” interactions. Acorns stated that AR was orchestrating people to do things and could very easily manipulate situations and then lie about what happened. Acorns explained that AR’s Dad was paying for Parenting 2000, a course for parents to help manage a child with challenging needs, to provide emotional and practical support as well as parenting skills in general.
15. Social Care reported that AR displayed obvious Autism Spectrum Disorder (“**ASD**”) traits. Social Care stated that AR did his own research, had no emotional range as he was only angry or sad, had no positivity and no facial expression. Social Care raised that they were concerned about AR’s parents as AR had a lot of control. Social Care noted that AR’s Mum and Dad tried to challenge AR but were met with negativity and aggression from him. Social Care explained that AR’s Dad was very quiet, and it seemed that both parents were struggling.
16. It was noted by Social Care that AR spoke with “*venom*” about his brother and laughed inappropriately. Social Care did not raise any concerns around neglect. Social Care highlighted that AR’s Mum and Dad worked full time.
17. PREVENT updated that there was a possibility of a CHANNEL Programme for AR as he had referenced beheading/war in Rwanda and inequality of the world. It was raised by PREVENT that AR had researched the Manchester Arena bombing and the “*good battle*” from the suicide bomber’s point of view. PREVENT pointed out that the research was not from a victim perspective. PREVENT stated that AR was at risk of further criminality due to impulsivity and that his trigger needed exploring. PREVENT highlighted that Parenting 2000 would not share information.
18. In the afternoon, I received an email from Stephanie Hallaron, Criminal Justice Liaison and Diversion Practitioner at Merseycare NHS Foundation Trust. Ms Halloran provided the contact details for John Hicklin, Clinical Nurse Specialist from FCAMHS who would be offering a consultation for AR. Ms Hallaron also provided the contact details for AR’s Social Worker, Anna Jameson. Ms Hallaron went on to explain that she included Jake Rigby for reference. Ms Halloran noted that following the strategy meeting, there was definitely some further information that needed exploring from a mental health point of view as, for example, there was no evidence

Southport Inquiry

to suggest that AR was being bullied which was his rationale for committing the offence and school had investigated this. Ms Hallaron highlighted that AR had also made statements in school about teachers poisoning his food and “*other bits and bobs*” that indicated possible psychosis. Ms Hallaron noted that I would see AR in the next week and informed me that if I needed any information from a criminal justice point of view then I could contact Ms Hallaron or Mr Rigby, and they would support as best they could.

19. I responded to Ms Hallaron to thank her for collating the email and noted that I would be meeting with AR and his Dad on Friday at the Southport Hub at 2.30 pm. I explained that I would liaise with Ms Hallaron and Mr Rigby the following Monday unless any other safeguarding concerns arose.

20th December 2019

20. On 20th December 2019, I had a face-to-face session with AR. AR came with his Mum to the session but spoke to me on his own. The purpose of the session was to gain information regarding AR’s assault on a peer.
21. AR stated that he had not experienced any form of harm in relation to the following risk areas: sexual assault, domestic violence, deliberate self-harm and suicidal ideation. AR explained that he felt he had ADD as his attention was poor; however, he did not think that he had autism. He was of this view due to him checking his symptoms online [DPA] AR noted that he did not like his brother but because he is his brother, but he would never hurt him. AR stated that he was different from his peers, but he could not elaborate why.
22. I asked AR about his demographic history. AR explained that his Mum and Dad are from Rwanda, and they moved to Cardiff where he and his brother were born. AR noted that he was seven when they moved from Cardiff to Southport.
23. Regarding the incident where AR took a knife and hockey stick into school, AR reported to me that he had thought of this on the Saturday night and ordered a taxi the following day. He explained that when the taxi arrived on Monday morning, he noticed his actual school taxi and the one he had booked. AR got into the taxi he had ordered. When AR arrived at the Range High School, he did not pay the taxi driver

Southport Inquiry

and stated that he threw his bag over the fence but struggled to climb over. AR stated that he walked through reception and walked around the school grounds for a bit after collecting his bag. AR noted that he bumped into his brother [DPA] [DPA] who then proceeded to follow AR. AR went on to explain that he attempted to go into assembly to look for [DPA] but that he did not get into the room and therefore walked away. AR stated that he felt sad that he could not find [DPA] and that he wanted to hit him. AR reported that he would have only used the knife if the hockey stick did not hurt [DPA] the way he had been hurt.

24. Regarding AR's mental health, in the Mental State Examination I recorded the following:

- Appearance – AR was well groomed, clean and tidy. There was no indication of self-neglect.
- Speech – AR made some eye contact, but this was not in line with his age; he appeared socially immature and did not engage in the way that a 14-year-old would typically present. He was very structured in his speech and repetitive with his answers.
- Attitude – AR reported wanting revenge for being bullied by [DPA]. He did not report any other inappropriate attitudes or beliefs. AR had aspirations to be a vet when he was older.
- Mood – AR reported getting frustrated sometimes, but this did not really impact his mood.
- Insight and judgement – AR had some insight into his actions; however, he was very linear in his thinking. He felt that [DPA] should suffer the way he did and could not understand how this would retaliate in wider social groups, meaning how AR's actions would then affect other people, peers, parents, school etc.
- Thoughts – AR stated that he did not get worried but had become a bit paranoid since the Police were in his house. He thought they may have placed cameras around. He had no hallucinations or delusions in line with any serious mental health condition. AR did not report any voices in or outside his head other than his own.

Southport Inquiry

25. In terms of AR's autism, my professional opinion was that AR did display atypical behaviours. He did not display any empathy or warmth, but he did laugh at my jokes and engaged well in the session. Although AR's thinking was rigid, he was capable of telling me the details of the assault and why he went to do this. There was no mention of other people's thoughts or feelings.
26. AR did not mention any thoughts of terrorism and stated that did not like thinking of Rwanda or 'back home'. He could not explain why he felt like that. He expressed thoughts of low self-esteem and confidence.
27. I have recorded that when the Police seized computers from the home, AR had recently been given an impressive gaming computer which he designed the specifications for and cost £3,000. For other neurotypical children AR's age, this would be a devastating consequence, but AR had no emotion regarding this being removed.
28. I spoke to AR's Mum and Dad after speaking with AR. They were worried regarding the consequences for AR but stated that he was a "good boy". His Mum and Dad were also feeling paranoid regarding cameras being placed in the home. They noted that they had no plans to return to Rwanda.
29. It was my professional opinion that AR was lonely and had had to mature quickly for his age and ability. I stated this as AR had black and white rigid thinking, in line with an autism diagnosis, reflected in his particular interest with history, dates, war and social justice. AR felt that his brother could be a burden and that he took up a lot of his Mum and Dad's time. As the younger sibling, AR felt a lot of resentment towards his brother and felt he was pushed out a lot at home and school. I was of the view that AR would not search for terrorism online other than from teenage curiosity with intense autistic backing. I noted that AR was still being monitored by the Police, PREVENT and Social Care.

6th January 2020

30. On 6th January 2020, I attended a Strategy Meeting. It was discussed that AR [DPA] [DPA] to remain on a Child In Need ("CIN") Plan until the Police evidence was back. A CIN plan applies to children who are under Section 17 of the Children

Southport Inquiry

Act 1989; it is a multi-agency plan to support children and their families when additional needs are identified. It was not escalated to a Section 47 at that time, indicating that a child protection enquiry was not deemed necessary under S47 of the Children Act 1989.

31. Later that day, I had clinical supervision with Julia Dunn, Assistant Clinical Lead at the Trust, and we discussed AR's case, including his mental health plan. Clinical supervision is dedicated time with a more experienced supervisor to obtain guidance, advice and support for each individual case on a practitioner's caseload.

8th January 2020

32. On 8th January 2020, I completed a CAMHS Risk Management Tool for AR. In relation to AR's legal status, I noted that he was on remand and on a CIN. In the alert section I recorded that AR attended his previous school with a modified hockey stick and a knife for a planned revenge attack against alleged bullying by a peer. Regarding whether any sibling was at risk, I noted that AR's brother was, but only if he hurt an animal. I highlighted that the family had no pets.

33. I also recorded the following in relation to various risk categories:

- Intentional risk to self (self-harm and suicide, past attempt) – lack of emotional regulation, has ASC.
- Unintentional risk to self (truancy, use of drugs and alcohol) – none.
- Intentional risk to others and property (harm, forensic history) – Yes. AR attended school to hurt another pupil but hurt a different pupil instead. AR stated that this was a planned revenge attack as a result of being bullied. Reports from school about terrorism but AR denied all of this. PREVENT also noted that they did not find anything malicious/radicalised with AR.
- Unintentional risk to others (e.g. walking in front of traffic) – none.

34. In relation to the risk management plan, I noted again that AR was on a CIN until the Police had checked in with his computer. Once this was received, we would then be

Southport Inquiry

able to establish a better plan going forward. AR was to remain at home without school and to see me from some emotional regulation work. This was for AR to understand his emotions and to learn how to manage these emotions in a positive and effective way, such as breathing techniques, mindfulness and effective communication.

35. I also completed a Key CAMHS Data document. In summary I noted the following:

- AR was on remand and on a CIN.
- In terms of disability this was behavioural and emotional; AR presented in a way that was in line with autism, and this affected his emotional intelligence and therefore how he would react to situations.
- AR did not think his disability limited his day-to-day activities; however, he did think his disability meant he required constant supervision.
- Joint working with education, LAC services, Social Care, School Health, Youth Offending Service, Alternative Education, Key Workers and Health Visitor.
- There was no Youth Justice Order at that time as charges were awaited.

3rd February 2020

36. On 3rd February 2020, I had Clinical Supervision, however I made no notes of this with regard to AR.

14th February 2020

37. On 14th February 2020, I sent a letter to Anna Jameson. I explained that AR was a 14-year-old male who presented with ASC traits and was on the ASC pathway awaiting assessment for a diagnosis. I noted that AR's convictions at the time seemed to be in line with ASC rigid thinking and lack of empathy.

Southport Inquiry

38. In relation to communication, I stated that when I had met with AR he would speak in a very clear monotone manner with basic phrases and singular sentences. AR could use language oddly and misinterpret what people around him were saying. I noted that AR had been reported to repeat words and phrases which he had heard and not necessarily understood but also repeatedly talked about things he was passionate about. I highlighted that AR frequently misinterpreted jokes and sarcasm as he could easily take them seriously and that he did not make eye contact.
39. I outlined that AR was a very polite young man and was eager to please. He could easily lose concentration and therefore his thought track in conversations. This became more apparent when there was more than one person in a conversation. I explained that AR could misunderstand simple instructions, body language and facial expressions and this was reflected in his own body language and facial expressions.
40. I noted that AR's lack of empathy and understanding in relation to his conviction for assault was co-morbid with ASC. AR had expressed on several occasions that the young person he was looking for had verbally abused him in the past and that he felt victimised and bullied by him. I stated that although this did not make what AR did right in attacking the other young man, it would explain AR's frustration in the context of having a "meltdown". AR was unable to hold his emotions any longer and could only see attacking the young person as a solution.
41. Regarding AR's social skills, I explained that he enjoyed his own company, was very adept with computers and had recently bought a modified specification PC for gaming which he chose the parameters for and designed the specifications. I noted that when I asked AR about his computer being seized by the Police, he showed no attachment or emotion to this being taken away even though he had only had it for a few weeks. I raised that if we took into consideration other young boys AR's age, without a neurodevelopmental difficulty, most would find losing their computer privileges hard, be quite upset and be able to verbalise this; however, AR did not. AR had no emotion at all, and he did not question if his PC would be returned. I noted that AR has been reported to not seek out social interactions with others. However, when he had sought out interactions in the past, it resulted in intense, smothering relationships which failed quite quickly. I highlighted that AR preferred to be in charge and struggled with turn taking and playing team games.
42. In relation to daily living, I explained that AR liked routine and struggled when his routine changed without warning. I noted that AR was a lot more content when in

Southport Inquiry

education as he understood the social etiquette of education. Regarding AR having ASC, I stated that over-reaction, aggressiveness and becoming overly emotional are traits and that this could be a possibility as to why when he could not find the person he was looking for, he lashed out at the other young man.

43. I noted that when I met with AR that he was aware of his behaviour and the consequences of this. However, I also felt that AR's behaviour was due to the possibility of having ASC. I felt that the possibility of AR having ASC needed to be taken into account with regard to his conviction and sentencing. I stated that from my meetings with AR and his parents, he had not presented with any mental health concerns, and I had not witnessed any safeguarding issues that could result in harm coming to anyone within the family home.

44. I concluded my letter by highlighting that AR was a bright young man who had a good insight into computers with the potential to learn to understand the world around him. I felt that with time AR would learn to understand his emotions and regulate them within situational contexts. This brought my involvement with AR to an end.

Issues relevant to my involvement

45. I attended the relevant meetings held by social care as documented to provide information around AR's behaviours and mental health concerns. I completed a Mental State Examination and found no significant concerns. I will have discussed this within my supervision meetings and had several peer conversations regarding AR and his mental health.

46. I only met with AR once and therefore could only assess what was presented to me then and via the strategy meetings I attended with other agencies. I did not work with AR long enough to build a solid relationship with him.

47. I only had one session with AR on 20th December 2019 and his MSE was completed as part of that. As Case Manager it was my responsibility to update the risk management tool which I did on 8th January 2020 following a further strategy meeting held on 6th January 2020. My involvement ended soon after.

48. All my handwritten notes were recorded on Meditech and then disposed of, following Trust policy.

Southport Inquiry

49. On 20th December 2019, I had a face-to-face session with AR. I concluded that I did not feel that AR would search for terrorism etc. online other than for teenage curiosity with intense autistic backing. The reason I concluded this is based on the session I had with AR that day. I could only assess what was provided by AR in that moment. AR did not express any thoughts of terrorism.

50. In terms of involvement with other agency, all telephone calls, emails and joint working were recorded on Meditech and there is nothing further to add from my recollection.

Reflection on events

51. On reflection, I do not believe that there is anything that either I or Alder Hey at the time could have done differently. I would have liked to have carried out a handover of AR's case to the subsequent case manager, however due to personal reasons I was not able to complete this. That said, I do not feel this would have affected AR's choices going forward.

52. The guidance, training and resources available to me were adequate for the nature of the involvement I had in the events under investigation. I had around 2.5 years post qualifying experience of working with children under the Children Act 1989 and working within multidisciplinary teams.

53. I cannot comment on any improvements that Alder Hey might make given the lapse of time since I worked for the Trust.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

Southport Inquiry

Signed:

Signature

Dated: 27th August 2025