

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel

Use of Force

| | |
|--|--|
| Panel date: | 26 September 2023 |
| Number of panel members in attendance: | Panel Chair and 13 members |
| Constabulary attendees: | <i>Inspector Jamie Rice, DC Julie McDougall-Waters, Caitlin Bones (Ethics and Legitimacy Coordinator)</i> |
| OPCC attendees: | <i>Matilda Henry (Senior Policy Officer), Charmaine Christie (Review, Compliance and Governance Officer), Charlotte Murfitt (Office Manager)</i> |
| Agenda item 1 | <p>Previous minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minutes from the previous Use of Force meeting on 25 July 2023 have not yet been circulated but will be after this meeting. |
| Agenda item 2 | <p>Actions from the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed at the last meeting that availability of requested BWV is no longer necessary to report on as it is usually 100% available. Reporting will be done by exception when BWV is not available. <i>ACTION: 23/07/25/01 Additional BWV should be made available where multiple officers are involved in order to assist in their scrutiny of the incident.</i> |
| Agenda item 3 | Use of Force scrutiny will follow within this document. |
| Minutes & AOB | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following this meeting, OPCC will be sending out a form to the Panel to capture feedback on taking the meetings online and how we can better capture their responses to PLANTER. HMICFRS are attending the next Stop and Search meeting. Next officer training dates are 31 October 2023 and 18 December 2023. They are held at Monks Wood and run from |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| | <p>8:45am - 3:30pm. If Panel members wish to attend, please contact Caitlin Bones via email at caitlin.bones@cambs.police.uk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel feedback: As a single parent it was extremely helpful for the panel to be online. • Plea from Panel Chair for members to attend officer training days as volunteers, however there is no expectation for people to attend. • The Chair of the JPS Scrutiny Panel has asked for more representation from Cambridgeshire and Bedfordshire on their Panel. If any member of the Panel would like to attend the JPS Scrutiny Panel please contact Panel Chair Keith Parish. The JPS Scrutiny Panel meet online once every three months. |
| Date of next meeting | 24 October 2023 – Stop and Search |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Panel date: | 26/09/23 | BWV reference: | UF/281426796/14 |
| Incident date: | 01/08/23 | Incident time: | 20:41:00 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|--------|--|
| Background information: | | | | | |
| <p>Neighbour of female calls police to say female has returned home and smashed up her house. She is now reported to be driving around with a hammer in her vehicle. Described as having erratic behaviour. Police have had contact with XXX today already. She has called police and been located by police earlier today. Mental health element to this incident. She attends Peterborough Police station to display art she has made about the police and their treatment of her in the past. Officers go out to meet her. Stopped for s.1 PACE stop while in her vehicle. Hammer found in the vehicle. After the incident, she told police that she had mental health problems and is hearing voices.</p> | | | | | |
| Type(s) of force seen (please tick): | | | | | |
| Handcuffs | | Firearms | | Shield | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Taser – Fired | | Unarmed Defence Tactics (UDT) | | Spit guard | |
| Taser – Red-dotted | | Pava spray | | Dogs | |
| Baton | | Leg restraint | | Other (state in comments) | |

| | |
|---|--|
| PLANTER Assessment (please select): | |
| If a member of your family experienced this use of force, would you be content with what you have seen? | |
| Did the officer seek to de-escalate prior to using force? | |
| If required, was medical attention sought? | |
| P – was the use of force proportionate for the risk faced by the officer? | |
| L – was the length of time the force used acceptable? | |
| A – do the actions of the member of the public warrant force to be used? | |
| N – was it necessary to use force to protect the officer(s) or members of the public? | |
| T – was the type of the force used appropriate? | |
| E – was it ethical to use force in the situation? | |
| R – Was it reasonable for the officer to use force? | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Code of Ethics: | |
| Honesty – I will be honest and will not abuse my position | |
| Selfless – I will act in the public's interest | |
| Respect – I will treat everyone with respect | |
| Discrimination – I will not discriminate unlawfully | |
| Without prejudice – I will act and make decisions without prejudice | |
| Do you think the officer adhered to the code of ethics (as detailed above)? | |

**Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident
(please complete if applicable):**

Comments:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments:

Comments discussed and noted at panel:

- Clearly distressing situation all round, but use of force was proportionate and reasonable, I think.
- Was a mental health professional present and if not, would that have been beneficial?
Force response (JMW) – There are mental health professionals available but they are not always on duty and able to be called upon to attend.
- Believe the officers came across as quite aggressive in their tone at the beginning.
- I believe officers could have tried to de-escalate the situation better by exercising a bit more patience. It seems that everything was rushed which meant that she became more anxious and distressed. Although they tried to speak to her, I felt they could have spoken to her throughout the process. This may have led her to comply. Understandably a hammer was involved but there was a lot of police officers present and they could have managed that situation far better.
- Believe there could have been more empathy applied and officers could have tried to talk her down more. Came across quite aggressive at the start.
- I think they escalated very quickly without re-assuring her to manage her anxiety.

RAG rating: Amber (92%)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:

Feedback:

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Panel date: | 26/09/23 | BWV reference: | UF/1419262050/15 |
| Incident date: | 04/08/23 | Incident time: | 15:30:00 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Background information: | | | | | |
| Subject was being arrested for prison recall. The BWV doesn't show the initial arrest at the start of the incident. | | | | | |
| Type(s) of force seen (please tick): | | | | | |
| Handcuffs | <input type="checkbox"/> | Firearms | <input type="checkbox"/> | Shield | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Taser – Fired | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unarmed Defence Tactics (UDT) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Spit guard | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Taser – Red-dotted | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pava spray | <input type="checkbox"/> | Dogs | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Baton | <input type="checkbox"/> | Leg restraint | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (state in comments) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| PLANTER Assessment (please select): | |
| If a member of your family experienced this use of force, would you be content with what you have seen? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Did the officer seek to de-escalate prior to using force? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If required, was medical attention sought? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| P – was the use of force proportionate for the risk faced by the officer? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| L – was the length of time the force used acceptable? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| A – do the actions of the member of the public warrant force to be used? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| N – was it necessary to use force to protect the officer(s) or members of the public? | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|--|
| T – was the type of the force used appropriate? | |
| E – was it ethical to use force in the situation? | |
| R – Was it reasonable for the officer to use force? | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Code of Ethics: | |
| Honesty – I will be honest and will not abuse my position | |
| Selfless – I will act in the public’s interest | |
| Respect – I will treat everyone with respect | |
| Discrimination – I will not discriminate unlawfully | |
| Without prejudice – I will act and make decisions without prejudice | |
| Do you think the officer adhered to the code of ethics (as detailed above)? | |

| |
|--|
| Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident (please complete if applicable): |
| Comments: |

| |
|--|
| Comments, concerns and/or compliments: |
| <p>Comments discussed and noted at panel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police officers displayed anger rather quickly, one of them shouted "shut up" near the start of the start of the exchange, then one of them said stop being stupid, and another said, "you think we were born yesterday". I think they could've been more professional, and firm but in an empathetic way rather than being angry and showing frustration. I believe their behaviour contributed to the situation needing first aid at the end. • The force used was reasonable and proportionate in order to affect the search, the member of the public was being obstructive and not listening to instructions by the |

officers. They could have used more professional language but understand that they were engaging with a number of different members of the public which was escalating the situation. The length of time force was used was reasonable.

- It's quite hard to see if they escalated properly or not without seeing the beginning of the interaction. However it didn't look at all like they tried to de-escalate which was a shame. Also not sure if it was necessary to have him pushed over the wall for so long rather than just stood up.
- Surely handcuffs made search harder in circumstances.
- He was being recalled to jail - he was going to be nabbed either way...right? I think based on that alone, cuffs are reasonable.
- I think the member of the public did not help at all with his obstructive behaviour in this situation. I do believe the police officers chose the wrong place to handcuff him. Over the wall did not seem like the best idea and it did not help them. Maybe they could have put him on the floor and used force better. The force used was reasonable due to the obstructive behaviour and the fact he kept resisting the force needed to be used for longer. The professional comments from the officers did not help at all. That is the part I would say they needed to work on but everything else seemed reasonable considering the situation.
- Would have been helpful to have seen the start of the police contact. Video did show that they were handling him very robustly in difficult circumstances. Cuffs were clearly distressing the individual but necessary.
- Just think they could have moved him away from the wall sooner, even taking him to ground to make it easier to cuff him.
- The police officer said "don't look at me" to the person being arrested. He seemed stressed and was behaving in the same way as the subject.
- The officer's reaction was not very professional.
- Officers escalated the situation with their behaviour and appeared slow to notice that the subject was having a medical episode but did take quick action to provide medical assistance once they realised. I understand it was a difficult situation with other members of the public becoming involved.
- The language of the officers being used was stressful, but stopped as soon as they realised he was having a medical episode. Wonder if their behaviour contributed to the subject going into a medical episode.

- Do officers know why the subject is being arrested?
Force response (JMW) – Not other than he is being arrested for prison recall.
- Officers did try their best and the length of time taken to arrest him was due to the subject resisting arrest.
- The subject was clearly aggressive and the officers were displaying behaviours in order to protect themselves as he was trying to reach into his pocket and was also resisting arrest. Therefore I feel that the officers behaviour was justifiable.
- Force (JR) – The male was correctly arrested as he was on recall to prison. Officers have seen he has something in his hand believed to be controlled drugs. Officers needed to get control of him and the item to prevent him from throwing it away or swallowing it and coming to harm. The officers may come across as stressed but it was a stressful situation and there were other members of the public there becoming involved. Having been in this type of situation, I believe the officers were doing their best to try and recover the drugs and prevent the male from coming to harm.
- Were all of the attending officers armed officers?
Force response (JR) - The officers who turned up with first aid were armed officers, but the arresting officers were not.

| | |
|--------------------|-------------|
| RAG rating: | Green (54%) |
|--------------------|-------------|

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Chair's comments and OPCC Summary: | |
| Actions arising: | Feedback: |
| | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Panel date: | 26/09/23 | BWV reference: | UF/2245101604/15 |
| Incident date: | 10/08/23 | Incident time: | 23:02:00 |

| |
|--------------------------------|
| Background information: |
|--------------------------------|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Third party report male has attacked his family with a hammer and knife. May still have knife. | | | | | |
| Type(s) of force seen (please tick): | | | | | |
| Handcuffs | | Firearms | | Shield | |
| Taser – Fired | | Unarmed Defence Tactics (UDT) | | Spit guard | |
| Taser – Red-dotted | | Pava spray | | Dogs | |
| Baton | | Leg restraint | | Other (state in comments) | |

| | |
|---|--|
| PLANTER Assessment (please select): | |
| If a member of your family experienced this use of force, would you be content with what you have seen? | |
| Did the officer seek to de-escalate prior to using force? | |
| If required, was medical attention sought? | |
| P – was the use of force proportionate for the risk faced by the officer? | |
| L – was the length of time the force used acceptable? | |
| A – do the actions of the member of the public warrant force to be used? | |
| N – was it necessary to use force to protect the officer(s) or members of the public? | |
| T – was the type of the force used appropriate? | |
| E – was it ethical to use force in the situation? | |
| R – Was it reasonable for the officer to use force? | |

| |
|--|
| Code of Ethics: |
| Honesty – I will be honest and will not abuse my position |
| Selfless – I will act in the public's interest |

| | |
|---|--|
| Respect – I will treat everyone with respect | |
| Discrimination – I will not discriminate unlawfully | |
| Without prejudice – I will act and make decisions without prejudice | |
| Do you think the officer adhered to the code of ethics (as detailed above)? | |

| |
|--|
| <p>Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident (please complete if applicable):</p> <p>Comments:</p> |
|--|

| |
|--|
| <p>Comments, concerns and/or compliments:</p> <p>Comments discussed at panel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think the officer handled the situation very well and this was a perfect video. • As soon as the officers gave instructions the suspect complied. The behaviour of the suspect was totally different to that of the previous incident, so they cannot be compared. There was no need for further force to be used, as the subject complied straight away. • Why were so many guns used and not a taser approach? It felt excessive and quite an American style of approach compared with the previous incident. <p>Force response (JR) – People tend to be more compliant when they are red dotted and have taser or guns pointed at them, so it's difficult to compare this incident to the previous incident. This was a firearms approach and instruction to use firearms would have been given by Oscar 1. The subject had attacked his family with a hammer and a knife and was believed to still have possession of the hammer, so he has shown aggression. Taser has a very low success rate, especially if being used on someone who's wearing layered clothing or a jacket for example.</p> <p>Firearms officers are deployed as a contingency, they do not want to use firearms, but they have them in case they are needed. Multiple officers will attend as this is safer for the officers and the subject. The subject was quickly compliant, I would</p> |
|--|

argue, due to having firearms pointed at him. Hopefully this explains why it may come across as excessive.

- Very sensible use of force, completely happy with that.
- Good use of force.
- Clear instructions. Professional and gained compliance in minimum time.
- What would have swayed the decision to send armed officers in this incident but not the previous incident?

Force response (JR) – A tactical firearms commander, Oscar 1 in the control room, would have assessed the situation for threat, harm, risk. In this instance the subject has used violence and used weapons. In simple terms that would have been why armed officers were sent.

| | |
|--------------------|-------------|
| RAG rating: | Green (91%) |
|--------------------|-------------|

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

| | |
|-------------------------|------------------|
| Actions arising: | Feedback: |
| | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Panel date: | 26/09/23 | BWV reference: | UF/3971221886/4 |
| Incident date: | 12/08/23 | Incident time: | 19:42:00 |

Background information:

Could not access incident log. Unclear who has called police. Possibly neighbours.

Type(s) of force seen (please tick):

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Handcuffs | <input type="checkbox"/> | Firearms | <input type="checkbox"/> | Shield | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Taser – Fired | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unarmed Defence Tactics (UDT) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Spit guard | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Taser – Red-dotted | | Pava spray | | Dogs | |
| Baton | | Leg restraint | | Other (state in comments) | |

| | |
|---|--|
| PLANTER Assessment (please select): | |
| If a member of your family experienced this use of force, would you be content with what you have seen? | |
| Did the officer seek to de-escalate prior to using force? | |
| If required, was medical attention sought? | |
| P – was the use of force proportionate for the risk faced by the officer? | |
| L – was the length of time the force used acceptable? | |
| A – do the actions of the member of the public warrant force to be used? | |
| N – was it necessary to use force to protect the officer(s) or members of the public? | |
| T – was the type of the force used appropriate? | |
| E – was it ethical to use force in the situation? | |
| R – Was it reasonable for the officer to use force? | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Code of Ethics: | |
| Honesty – I will be honest and will not abuse my position | |
| Selfless – I will act in the public’s interest | |
| Respect – I will treat everyone with respect | |
| Discrimination – I will not discriminate unlawfully | |
| Without prejudice – I will act and make decisions without prejudice | |
| Do you think the officer adhered to the code of ethics (as detailed above)? | |

Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident

(please complete if applicable):

Comments:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments:

Comments discussed at panel:

- Officers conduct was really, really good.
- Did officer announce their taser was drawn?
Force response (JMW) – Yes.
- Reasonable, clear communication.
- Reasonable and proportionate use of force. De-escalated as soon as the threat was managed.
- Officer very calm and assertive. Managed to diffuse the situation quickly.
- Entirely sensible - short duration, ended use of force when she could.
- Instructions clear and it was necessary to use force.

RAG rating: Green (100%)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:

Feedback:

Panel date: 26/09/23 **BWV reference:** UF/2528448410/6

Incident date: 14/08/23 **Incident time:** 22:30:00

Background information:

Female caller reporting domestic abuse. States he has "beaten the XXX out" of her. He has a knife.

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Type(s) of force seen (please tick): | | | | | |
| Handcuffs | | Firearms | | Shield | |
| Taser – Fired | | Unarmed Defence Tactics (UDT) | | Spit guard | |
| Taser – Red-dotted | | Pava spray | | Dogs | |
| Baton | | Leg restraint | | Other (state in comments) | |

| | |
|---|--|
| PLANTER Assessment (please select): | |
| If a member of your family experienced this use of force, would you be content with what you have seen? | |
| Did the officer seek to de-escalate prior to using force? | |
| If required, was medical attention sought? | |
| P – was the use of force proportionate for the risk faced by the officer? | |
| L – was the length of time the force used acceptable? | |
| A – do the actions of the member of the public warrant force to be used? | |
| N – was it necessary to use force to protect the officer(s) or members of the public? | |
| T – was the type of the force used appropriate? | |
| E – was it ethical to use force in the situation? | |
| R – Was it reasonable for the officer to use force? | |

| |
|--|
| Code of Ethics: |
| Honesty – I will be honest and will not abuse my position |
| Selfless – I will act in the public's interest |
| Respect – I will treat everyone with respect |
| Discrimination – I will not discriminate unlawfully |

Without prejudice – I will act and make decisions without prejudice

Do you think the officer adhered to the code of ethics (as detailed above)?

**Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident
(please complete if applicable):**

Comments:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments:

Comments discussed at panel:

- Why did an officer go back in the house shouting to someone else after the male had been arrested and women had already exited?
Force response (JMW) – An officer will do that in case anyone else is still in the house, to make sure everyone is out.
- I didn't see officers use pressure points as a use of force, as listed on the grounds. Appears to have been an adequate use of force used given the circumstances given.
Force response (JMW) – I agree, did not see pressure points used.
- Good trigger discipline from the firearms officer - glad to see that!
- The officer put his boot on the man, I thought that was unnecessary.
- Think it was unnecessary for an officer to put their boot on the male after he tried to get up as he then went back to the floor. I believe the male misunderstood the officer's instruction when they said to handcuff him which is why he went to get up but got back down when told.
- Yes, I agree the boot on the male's back was completely unnecessary.
Force response (JR) – The officer saw the male trying to get up, he was holding a weapon, potentially this is why he used his boot to stop the individual from getting up. Not trying to justify the officer putting his boot on the back of the subject, but this is probably why it was used, to prevent the subject from getting up.
- I think a second of boot contact isn't necessarily out of the question, certainly

better than having a struggle on their hands.

- Seemed pretty straightforward in terms of the situation. However the boot to the back was not necessary at all. I don't think that was required. Seemed member of public was already going back down so I didn't see the need for the kick or the boot to the back.
- No justification, but rather a boot than a bullet in this situation.
- Not apparent what pressure used with boot and may be light touch to stop him getting up.

RAG rating: Green (92%)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

| Actions arising: | Feedback: |
|------------------|-----------|
| | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Panel date: | 26/09/23 | BWV reference: | UF/2560361159/6 |
| Incident date: | 17/08/23 | Incident time: | 03:16:00 |

Background information:

CCTV have seen 16-year-old male handling a large knife. Female has also handled it. CCTV identify female who handled knife. She is detained for a section 1 PACE search.

Type(s) of force seen (please tick):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Handcuffs | | Firearms | | Shield | |
| Taser – Fired | | Unarmed Defence Tactics (UDT) | | Spit guard | |
| Taser – Red-dotted | | Pava spray | | Dogs | |
| Baton | | Leg restraint | | Other (state in comments) | |

| PLANTER Assessment (please select): | |
|---|--|
| If a member of your family experienced this use of force, would you be content with what you have seen? | |
| Did the officer seek to de-escalate prior to using force? | |
| If required, was medical attention sought? | |
| P – was the use of force proportionate for the risk faced by the officer? | |
| L – was the length of time the force used acceptable? | |
| A – do the actions of the member of the public warrant force to be used? | |
| N – was it necessary to use force to protect the officer(s) or members of the public? | |
| T – was the type of the force used appropriate? | |
| E – was it ethical to use force in the situation? | |
| R – Was it reasonable for the officer to use force? | |

| Code of Ethics: | |
|---|--|
| Honesty – I will be honest and will not abuse my position | |
| Selfless – I will act in the public's interest | |
| Respect – I will treat everyone with respect | |
| Discrimination – I will not discriminate unlawfully | |
| Without prejudice – I will act and make decisions without prejudice | |
| Do you think the officer adhered to the code of ethics (as detailed above)? | |

**Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident
(please complete if applicable):**

Comments:

Further BWV was shown from two other officers in attendance.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments:

• **Comments discussed at panel:**

- The police were remarkably calm and patient in a really testing situation - should be commended.
- 13/14-year-olds out at 3.45am! Lucky none arrested for breach of peace.
- That's compassionate - ensuring the cuffs don't tighten too much.
- Use of force necessary. Instructions very clear. Well done. Officers calm while executing the search.
- Well done.
- If the subjects were seen on CCTV with a knife, why were armed response not sent? The officers response was very good considering the subjects resisting and being aggravating. The officers did not become stressed or behave inappropriately. Force response (JR) – Unable to answer specific to this incident, however, it may be due to the area being remote (Ramsey) and therefore the speed of which armed response could have attended may have been significant. May have been that there were local officers patrolling nearby who were armed with taser and could get there quicker. May have been that the subjects were not seen fighting or threatening anyone.
- It's alarming that one of the females was able to get into the male subject's pocket and pull his phone out. That could have been dangerous considering they were thought to have possession of a knife.
Force response (JR) – Yes that was alarming and valid feedback. Officers should have tried to get better control on all subjects straight away.

RAG rating:

Green (92%)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

| Actions arising: | Feedback: |
|--|------------------|
| Feedback to officers that they could have compromised their own safety by allowing one of the females to remove something from the male's pocket, especially given that they had been seen handling a knife. | |