

Minutes from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel

3rd Use of Force Community Scrutiny Panel Meeting

Date: 26th April 2022

Time: 18:30 – 20:30

Venue: Thorpe Wood Police Station, Longthorpe, Peterborough

Attendees:

- 11 independent panel members
- Supt Robin Sissons - Cambridgeshire Constabulary (RS)
- PC Julie McDougall-Waters - Cambridgeshire Constabulary (JM-W)
- Jack Hudson – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
- Charmaine Christie – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Introduction and updates since last meeting

The Chair AG welcomed members of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel (the “Panel”) to the scrutiny meeting of Cambridgeshire Constabulary’s (the “Constabulary”) Use of Force (UoF) powers.

Panel Members, and attendees from the Constabulary and Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), introduced themselves.

Minutes of the previous Use of Force meeting

AG reviewed the minutes and actions of the previous UoF scrutiny meeting.

The following action is still open:

ACTION: There is a primary conduct column on TuServ that states ‘Other’. If any ‘other’ column is used, it needs to be accompanied with a compulsory free text field to state what the ‘other’ is. (For Constabulary).

RS advised that the Constabulary is waiting for the next system upgrade to be able to do this.

ACTION: Agreed that Chair and Constabulary will meet to discuss further. (For CSP Chair and Constabulary).

The following action is still open:

ACTION: To see whether the other attending officer completed a UoF form due to them holding CS spray. (For the Constabulary).

JM-W stated that this was checked and it was not selected that this was done.

AG asked if feedback could be given to the officer. Action can then be closed.

ACTION: Feedback to be given to the officer. (For Constabulary).

All other previous actions have been completed and closed.

The minutes were agreed.

Confidentiality Agreement

Panel Members that had not already signed the annual confidentiality agreement at the Annual General Meeting were asked to sign individual Confidentiality Agreements, to be returned to the OPCC at the end of the meeting.

Explanation of TuServ

AG explained to the Panel the previous issue found with TuServ where Body Worn Video (BWV) was not being held long enough. Therefore, BWV was being wiped from the system prior to being used for scrutiny sessions. This has now been changed. TuServ records for the month had shown a disproportionate number of 'NOBWV' being available.

JM-W explained that the Constabulary is currently exploring whether there are system issues causing an error, or whether officers aren't uploading BWV when they should. The system shows that BWV has not been recorded on incidents where RS believes the incidents would have been recorded, so it appears that the system may not be showing correctly. Exploration of this is still ongoing.

ACTION: Constabulary to investigate availability or system issues with TuServ and BWV data recording. (For the Constabulary).

Until details of known system errors are clarified, AG would continue to select cases AG to select incidents without knowing whether BWV has been recorded so the Constabulary can see whether it is being recorded when it should be.

Use of Force Scrutiny

All Panel Members had a scrutiny pack including information to aid their scrutiny of the BWVs. These included:

- Code of Ethics summary (from the College of Policing's website)
- UoF Assessment and Rating sheet (one for each BWV shown), including the 'PLANTER' assessment ('PLANTER' being the mnemonic used to assess the interaction between the police force and the person subject to the use of force)
- UoF legal powers
- Grounds for use of force (one for each BWV shown)
- Confidentiality Agreement

Following the viewing of each BWV, EW asked Panel members for their individual views on the UoF encounter, using the assessment sheet as a guide.

Body Worn Video 1

JM-W provided background information to the relating incident.

Young male reported missing by parent. Frequent missing person. BWV featured hands on restraint.

Panel Member's comments included:

- Panel were happy with the code of ethics.
- The UoF was appropriate but did not think that one of the officers showed empathy & was confrontational.
- The comments made by officers did not help to de-escalate and were not respectful to the child.
- Panel Members agreed that the behaviours they were not happy with were from the officer who did most of the talking, not the officer whose BWV was viewed.

- Officers tried to keep the child calm. Their voices adjusted due to the change in the child's behaviour.
- There were inflammatory comments made at some stages, however generally the officers did try to calm the child down and made a good effort with him.

The Panel agreed that the overall rating was: **Green 2**.

Detailed comments and feedback can be seen at Appendix 1.

AG requested that, understanding that the officers are not trained social workers, feedback is given to the officers to be mindful of their communication style and speaking about the child to his father in front of him.

ACTION: The above feedback from AG to be given to the officers involved (for the Constabulary).

Body Worn Video 2

JM-W provided background information to the relating incident.

BWV from both officers in attendance was viewed.

Young male reportedly made threats to parents and smashing items with a weapon. Seen with a wooden pole on attendance. The BWV featured handcuffs, shield, hands on and a taser (red-dotted, not fired).

Panel Member's comments included:

- Some of the Panel believed officers used good communication. Others felt more communication was needed to try to de-escalate prior to re-dotting the taser after seeing the bat.
- Officers are going into the property knowing there is danger due to what has been reported. Officers appropriately assessed the situation.
- The child made multiple threats and when the officer went up the stairs, the child was holding a weapon, so UoF was necessary.
- The child was not smashing up the property at the point the officers enter, so there was no visible threat to the officer prior to seeing the weapon.

- The shield was ready when they walked in, it was then put to one side after entering. The taser was only drawn when the officer walked upstairs and saw the weapon. It was only red-dotted and not a charge.
- Panel was mixed as to whether handcuffs should have been used.

RS explained that once someone has been arrested their liberty has been taken from them. His pockets have not been searched at this point so it is unknown what he may have on him. It would be good practice to handcuff at this point to make sure all parties are kept safe.

The Panel agreed that the overall rating was **Green 3**.

Detailed comments and feedback can be seen at Appendix 2.

AG asked for feedback to be provided to the officers, that there was potential for further tries of de-escalation prior to using the taser. There should be a second input for UoF by the second officer. Officer should be mindful of where BWV is placed as her hand covers it when using the radio.

ACTION: For above feedback by AG to be given to officers involved in this incident (for the Constabulary).

BREAK

One Panel Member left the meeting.

Body Worn Video 3

JM-W provided background information to the relating incident. No Stop and Search form had been completed by the officer. As the person was arrested, the officer believed that the custody officer would complete the form. However, this should have been completed by the officer and this will be fed back to the officer.

Young male, not old enough to drive, found sitting alone in a car. The BWV featured handcuffs.

Panel Member's comments included:

- Some Panel members did not feel it proportionate to use handcuffs, as there was no danger to the officer or suspect. Other members felt it was reasonable for him to be handcuffed as the officer was single crewed and awaiting another officer's attendance.
- The BWV starts at the point of handcuffing, so it is difficult to understand the lead up to him being cuffed.
- Officers should give clear reasons for cuffing. In the BWV we just hear the officer say, 'I don't want you to do anything silly'.
- None of the Panel took issue with the ethics.

JM-W explained that, as this incident is linked to possible drugs offences, the officer may have cuffed the person to prevent him from concealing drugs and because he was single crewed.

RS stated that based on his experience, he would have handcuffed the male, as he may have pulled a weapon out from his side. Other than handcuffing, the officer could have taken the child out of the car so he could see fully what he was doing, however the child may then have run off.

The Panel agreed that the overall rating was **Green 2**.

Detailed comments and feedback can be seen at Appendix 3.

Appendices 1, 2 and 3 are attached.

Any Other Business

None.

ACTION: Can we have a session on 28th June and no session in July (for the OPCC).