



Panel date:	24 October 2023
Number of panel members in attendance:	<i>Panel Chair And 15 panel members</i>
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Superintendent Robin Sissons, Inspector James Thorne, PS Ciaran Constable, DC Julie McDougall-Waters, Caitlin Bones (Ethics and Legitimacy Coordinator).</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Jack Hudson (Director of Governance and Compliance), Charmaine Christie (Review, Compliance and Governance Officer), Charlotte Murfitt (Office Manager).</i>
Additional attendees:	<i>Ali Burlington (IOPC), Shenée Nash (IOPC).</i>
Agenda item 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of Previous Meeting. Agreed by Panel. Signed off by Chair.
Agenda item 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actions arising from previous meeting. N/A.
Agenda item 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequent Searchers Data.
Agenda item 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation from IOPC (Independent Office of Police Conduct). Panel Chair: How have you recruited young people to your youth panel? IOPC response: We have commissioned organisation Leaders Unlocked to recruit youth panel members. Vice Chair: How many complaints are linked to stop and search in Cambridgeshire? IOPC response: Between 1 April 2022 – 31 March 2023 there were twenty-three allegations made regarding stop and search against Cambridgeshire police, however not all, or potentially any, of these will make it to the IOPC. I can take this away and find out how many cases were taken on by the IOPC. ACTION: For IOPC to provide this data to OPCC to pass on

	to the Panel.
Minutes & AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes from previous meeting signed off. ACTION: For OPCC to arrange to take Panel members for a visit of a custody suite. Potentially link in the Independent Custody Visit (ICV) visit. Panel Chair: How many strip searches of juveniles has there been in the past year with Cambridgeshire Constabulary? Force response (CB): For 2021 we had six child strip searches, ten for 2022 and so far, four for 2023. Force response (JT): The Constabulary conducted five intimate searches on children from October 2022 to present. The ages of those searched were three 17-year-olds, one 16-year-old and one 15-year-old. Next stop and search training day is 31 October 2023. There is another one on 18 December 2023. Please contact Caitlin Bones if you wish to attend. ACTION: OPCC to send out the IOPC slides to the Panel. Last stop and search training session of the year for Panel members is upcoming if anyone would like a refresher. Please let OPCC know and this will be passed on to the Constabulary.
Date of next meeting	Tuesday 21 November at Constabulary HQ, Huntingdon.

Incident 1

Panel date:	24/10/2023	BWV reference:	SS/0112067268/1
Number of attendees:		Incident date:	14/09/2023
		Incident time:	11:08

Grounds: Written Assessment

Did the grounds provide sufficient evidence that a reasonable person would have concluded, on an objective basis, that the stop and search should be undertaken?

Overview: Reports of a male seen carrying a bladed article. Plain clothed officer confirms to uniformed officers' location of suspect who is also well known to police. Male detained and searched. Nothing found.

Comments:

- Grounds seem very good and are well written.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from Panel members:

- We didn't see the handcuffs go on.
- The officers did very well. It was a good stop and search.
- It's been a common issue that officers only start the BWV (Body Worn Video) after the interaction has started. In cases like these they have plenty of time to switch on during their approach to the Subject. I think it's important for us to understand how these situations commence as well as how they are conducted and/or resolved.
- The video footage was very poor quality. However the officers were very respectful and explained themselves clearly right through the process.
- Officer identified herself clearly, the reasons for the stop and search and was respectful whilst conducting the search. Spoke to member of public in an appropriate manner and explained each part of the search in terms of where she was going to look before she continued.
- GOWISELY was executed but it was not done so confidently.
- Perhaps they could have questioned the Subject a bit more prior to just going straight into the search.
- From the stop and search training if I remember correctly, we don't collect data on whether the individual is vulnerable in some way. I think this data would be really helpful to monitor.
- I believe she did a great job.

RAG rating: Green 100%

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:
Name:	Date:

Incident 2			
Panel date:	24/10/2023	BWV reference:	SS/0239257088/16
Number of attendees:		Incident date:	06/09/2023
		Incident time:	20:00

Grounds: Written Assessment
Did the grounds provide sufficient evidence that a reasonable person would have concluded, on an objective basis, that the stop and search should be undertaken?
Overview: Reports received of a group of youths producing a knife when approached regarding their behaviour. 2 young males and 2 young females. BWV shows the young males being searched for the bladed article by a male officer. No item found.
Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel Chair: Written grounds appear too long. This seems to be a reoccurring issue. • I feel that it is better for the grounds to be detailed as the officer has clearly explained why they have stopped a particular person. • We have previously criticised officers for not giving enough detail. Now they are giving more detail so we should appreciate this. • Written grounds should be concise. • Could some training on writing grounds be given. Does this happen? <p>Force response (RS): We have considered whether there should be a set template for written grounds, however this can impact on what officers write down so</p>

decided against it.

- Vice Chair: It's not that it's too much, it's considering the amount of extra time that they are required to complete this, many of whom do so in their own time, making their shifts very long. It's a matter of achieving balance.
- Concern that a requirement for such detailed grounds could add to the stress on junior officers.
- From reading the grounds it seems that there were multiple people present but it only references one person being searched. Why were not all searched?
Force response (CC): These grounds only relate to one of the people that were searched. There will be other records for the other people that are searched.
- I think in this case, the detailed grounds are useful. They could be more concise of course but the amount of detail is correct. I also agree with Chiedze that given the circumstances, it is important to make clear in the grounds as to why the particular child was searched. This has been done.

Grounds: RAG rating

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from Panel members:

- Why is he asking for their personal details, which I thought they are not required to give?
Force (CC): Officers will always ask for a person's details however people are not required to give them.
- The officer was speaking very quickly and I had to concentrate to hear what was being said. I'm not sure if the children would have understood what was being said.
- GOWISLEY was given but sporadically throughout the interaction. It was very fast.
- Polite and good stop but could have been friendlier.
- I think the officer even said it's a legal requirement for them to give.
- I think officers may need some training on the difference between ethnicity and nationality.
- Very misleading to these kids. They don't know their right not to give their details. It's not right.
- Indeed, they should be informed beforehand.
- Doesn't appear the subjects understood their rights in relation to providing their

details.

- Although everything was explained it was explained very quickly and the officer didn't appear to give thought to how young the subjects were.
- The subjects were very young and were dealt with very rapidly by the officer. They weren't advised that they didn't have to provide their information. Felt uncomfortable with the situation.
- Assertive, polite and essential for police to exercise authority in case of the threat of a knife.
- **ACTION:** Feedback to officers that they need to be better at stating what subjects are required and not required to do/say. Specifically, in relation to providing their personal details.

Force response (RS): All agreed, we will take all this feedback away and Inspector Thorne will sit down with the officers and go through it with them.

RAG rating: Amber (75%)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:
Name:	Date:

Incident 3

Panel date:	24/10/2023	BWV reference:	SS/0801182856/29
Number of attendees:		Incident date:	03/09/2023
		Incident time:	20:41

Grounds: Written Assessment

Did the grounds provide sufficient evidence that a reasonable person would have concluded, on an objective basis, that the stop and search should be undertaken?

Overview: Officers on patrol have seen a male in a stationary car who they recognise from previous stop and searches for possession of cannabis. The male has switched seats by the time the officers have come back to the car. The suspect is searched under section 23 and articles are found.

Comments:**Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:**

- The whole approach seems far too casual.
- Panel Chair: It is not enough to stop and search someone due to the smell of cannabis alone. Can the force comment on this?
Force response (RS): Officers need to give specific grounds to search each individual in a car, they can't all be searched due to one person smoking cannabis.
- There were a lot of people around. It seemed haphazard, should officers have called for further support?
Force response (CC): Later in the video it shows officers calling for further support.
- Didn't hear GOWISLEY in full. Appeared to stop halfway through.
- Is knowing that someone had been caught with cannabis before, along with suspected smell, enough for a stop and search?
Force response (RS): The grounds have to be recent and relevant. If you had a past cannabis warning from years ago then that wouldn't be relevant to now.
- Didn't hear GOWISELY in full, but audio is poor. Did they establish who was driving, could they have done a drugs test, since one or other was the driver, and grounds says Subject admits having used cannabis. Who are the other two that turn up?
Force response (RS): The power to administer a preliminary test (for drugs) is available, however you have to be specially authorised by the Chief in order to administer a drug wipe. Generally speaking, those authorised are on roads policing, ex roads policing and a very few number of local response officers.
- Cannabis affects driving ability. Why was he not arrested? Cannabis is the drug most associated with road accidents.

- Where was the article found, on the Subject or in the Car?
- The stop and search may not have appeared completely professional but it seems that he may have been trying to keep the situation calm. I was happy with how it was conducted.
- A full GOWISLEY was not conducted.
- I felt it was all a bit messy and confusing, to be honest. The audio quality wasn't great and there seemed to be a lot of people, passing, speaking, etc.

RAG rating: Green / Amber (50%/50%)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:
Name:	Date: