

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel
Use of Force Capture Document



Panel date:	21/11/2023
Number of panel members in attendance:	12 panel members were in attendance
Constabulary attendees:	<i>PS Ciaran Constable, Supt Robin Sissons, Caitlin Bones, PS Matt Hart</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Charmaine Christie, Matilda Pearson</i>
Agenda item 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous Minutes: Signed off by Chair.
Agenda item 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions from Last Meeting: N/A.
Agenda item 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strip Searches: Panel member comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appreciate that consideration has been given in the officer guides to those that may be menstruating at the time of strip search and how to handle this. ○ What happens if officers suspect that someone has hidden something internally? Force response: There is a different approach that is followed in this instance. If it is thought something has been hidden internally, then that person will be taken to the hospital for a potential scan and/or search. Authority has to be granted for this and consent has to be given by the subject. ○ If someone has drugs hidden on them, are they first asked by officers to remove it themselves and hand it over, or do officers have to go straight into the formal process of a strip search? Force response: A custody sergeant would not want to take the risk of someone removing the drugs themselves in case the person suddenly takes it. This poses a safety issue and therefore the formal process will be followed by officers to remove any drugs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The strip searches we have seen today are compliant. Is there anything panel members should be looking for in terms of non-complainant searches and issues in relation to complaints reported in the media? Force response: The guide is written in terms of conducting compliant strip searches. Cambridgeshire Constabulary do not receive many complaints in relation to strip searches, however we want to carry out public scrutiny to assure there are no issues with how strip searches are conducted within Cambridgeshire. ○ It would be useful for us to view non-compliant strip searches to see how these are carried out. ○ It would be helpful to see the whole journey from someone being stopped, through to them being taken to custody and then strip searched. Force response: It is for the Panel to decide whether they would like to view the initial stop and what led to the strip search to give further context. This can be supplied.
AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Custody Scrutiny: Panel members were advised that scrutiny of custody is going to be introduced and all panel members will be invited to attend. These will be chaired by an Independent Custody Visitor (ICV). ● Stop and Search Cards: The Constabulary have produced cards that can be given to members of the public to provide information on stop and search and a link to the Constabulary's website that provides additional information.
Date of next meeting	Tuesday 23 rd January 2024 at HQ

Incident 1			
Panel date:	21/11/2023	BWV reference:	UF/3224221830/31
Incident date:	06/10/2023	Incident time:	13:42

Background information:

Police have been driving up MILTON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, at 13:40 hrs approximately, when they have witnessed the male stood outside the Co-Op and punch a MoP in the face. Police have pulled up next to him and put the blue lights on and he has first attempted to get on his push bicycle however not managed to do so and then thrown the bike to the floor and attempted to run away from police in the direction of Mitchums Corner.

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

Comments from panel members:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Not happy with the officer swearing at the subject.
- When the subject started shaking, they should have put him into the recovery position, regardless of whether or not he was faking it.
- Is there a reason officers began by putting the subject on the ground?
Force response: Officers were initially searching for a knife. They have more control over the situation with the subject being on the floor.
- Apart from the swearing, the officers dealt with the subject very well and acted compliantly.
- Clear communication from officers.
- Aside from the swearing, officers remained calm and professional.
- The written grounds were clear and well written.
- Polite attitude, apart from the swearing.
- Could the subject have been invited to stand up once he had been handcuffed?
- If the person was arrested, could they not have been searched elsewhere?
- Could he have been placed in the back of a vehicle rather than police van? Is a van always necessary?

- No issues with PLANTER.
- Looked like the subject was aware of how to play the system, so it looks like there was more force used at the time of his arrest. Apart from the swearing, the arrest it was compliant.
- The subject says they are having a fit and no one asks if they are OK, granted the subject seemed to be messing around.

RAG rating: Green (all)

Chair's comments and OPCC summary:

All members agreed that this was rated green, any questions that they had were able to be answered during the meeting and therefore any queries were explained.

Actions arising:

N/A

Feedback:

I have emailed PC XXXXXXXXX (and their supervisor) and made them aware regarding the use of poor language.

Name: Insp 651 Thorne

Date: 02/02/2024

Response from the officer on receipt of the feedback from the CSP was very apologetic for the language used. He explained that he had tried to use calm, polite and reasonable language but that it wasn't working, so he changed to short, loud, harsh and abrasive language to gain the desired response.

He reassured Insp Thorne that this is not his go to form of tactical communications and he will work to reduce it. He explained that the reason BWV was activated later was because he thought he had activated it during a chase, but then when he checked before confrontation, it appeared to not be fully on.

The BWV does not show the suspect going over the fence coming face to face with the officer and trying to evade them, which is the reason it appears the interaction started on the ground. The officer confirmed he was fatigued after a chase and it was therefore more manageable to keep the suspect on the ground until a colleague arrived.

Give that the suspect had previously tried to escape and fight the officer, it was also felt keeping control of him on the ground was the safest place and most appropriate way to

search him.

The officer has taken on board that he did not ask if the suspect was ok, he believed he was being racially abusive towards him.

The officer seemed genuinely remorseful on receipt of the panel feedback and recognised the learning required going forward.

Incident 2

Panel date:	21/11/2023	BWV reference:	UF/3086342101/27
Incident date:	01/10/2023	Incident time:	15:01

Background information:

Victim has called police to say dispute over parking. Suspect has kicked victim's car and made a racial slur towards her. One officer assaulted by suspect.

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

Comments from panel members:

N/A

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Did the officers already know the subject was mentally unwell?
Force response: Believe the female officer recognised him. Officers will go back to the station, look up details and write up the use of force form afterwards, so may have found this out then.
- When someone is told they are arrested, does this automatically mean they will be handcuffed?
Force response: It would be expected that most people who are arrested are handcuffed as a matter of safety. However, it is the officer's decision and they are trained that there should not be an automatic decision made to handcuff. When an officer brings someone into custody, they will be asked to justify their use of handcuffs.

- Panel Chair: I have heard that not every officer is recording handcuffing as a use of force.
Force response: We are aware there is a potential issue surrounding this and we are addressing this.
- The officers made a judgement call whether to use handcuffs and when the subject's demeanour changes, their decision to use handcuffs changed. The officers are quite sarcastic in their demeanour, however, their use of force is justified. There is a potential issue with the officers use of language and demeanour.
- The sound quality of the BWV was not clear so unable to hear the subjects responses clearly.
- The sarcasm from the officer was unprofessional.
- Subject resisted arrest and was then taken to the floor after assaulting one of the officers. Lack of communication during the time the subject was on the floor.
- No issues with PLANTER or ethics.
- Officers did very well. Proportionate use of force and time.
- Correct amount of force was used after the subject assaulted an officer.
- Use of force was warranted. Officers' judgement calls were spot on. However, the sarcastic comments from officers were not warranted. Otherwise well done to the officers on how they conducted themselves.

RAG rating:	Green (all)
--------------------	-------------

Name:	Date:
--------------	--------------

Chair's comments and OPCC summary:

All members agreed that this was rated green, any questions that they had were able to be answered during the meeting and therefore any queries were explained.

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

N/A	I have emailed PC XXXXXXXX and made them aware of how sarcastic comments can undermine policing.
-----	--

Name: Insp 651 Thorne	Date: 02/02/2024
------------------------------	-------------------------