



Panel date:	23 <sup>rd</sup> May 2024
Number of panel members in attendance:	7
Constabulary attendees:	2
OPCC attendees:	<i>Matilda Pearson (MP), Helen Slater (HS)</i>
	<p><b><u>Previous Minutes and Actions</u></b></p> <p>Action closed re ABD and all the questions that supported this. Force updated panel members verbally on this action at the previous panel meeting, it has also been addressed within the minutes for further information.</p> <p>Previous Use of Force Panel Minutes agreed and approved.</p>
	Vice-chair thanked those who attended the Community Scrutiny Panel AGM.
	Vice-chair reminded panel members about the JPS event on 6 <sup>th</sup> July at Monks Wood. Force can recirculate details.
	<p><b><u>Frequent Users of Force</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification was sought on how officers were referenced, and on what is done internally to monitor the frequent users.</li> <li>• Clarification was sought on ethnicity and gender and whether they are self-defined or not, it was confirmed they are.</li> <li>• Clarification was sought on what ‘improvised UoF’ meant. It was confirmed that sometimes there are situations where taught UoF methods aren’t useable so an adapted method might have to be used. There is a requirement for further explanation when ‘Improvised UoF’ is recorded.</li> <li>• A comment was made that 10 instances of UoF for one officer seems particularly high. Panel was reassured that if an officer appears on this list frequently, further scrutiny is</li> </ul>

	applied. Additionally, it was explained that different duties and shifts inevitably incur more frequent UoF.
	<b><u>UoF Selection</u></b> 6 entries were provided by the OPCC and have been randomised. Only 4 of the ones chosen have body worn video available due to the incidents occurring over a year ago (before the new DAMS BWV system was in place).
AOB	The OPCC advised that the PCC has chosen a new logo that has been designed by a student at ARU. Panel members were informed that the OPCC would be raising this with the Chair of the panel for him to consider whether they would like to update the Community Scrutiny Panel logo.
Date of next meeting	27 <sup>th</sup> June 2024 - Custody Detention Scrutiny Panel

Incident 1			
Review Date:	23/05/2024	BWV reference:	UF/4125496120/3
Incident Date:	3/8/2023	Incident time:	16:23

<b>Background Information:</b>
Breached restraining order relating to harassment.

<b>Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident (please complete if applicable):</b>
N/A

<b>Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officer gave a good explanation of the reason for arrest.</li> <li>• Why were there so many police cars? It was at a police station.</li> <li>• Why was the police officer in black not wearing collar number? Force to feedback.</li> <li>• When the subject was in the van and making accusations of the officer, there is no BWV of the officer she is talking about so there is no evidence whether there are</li> </ul>

any issues with her accusations or not. Suggestion is maybe a camera on the back of the van would be useful in instances such as this.

- Panel members found that she was compliant and unlikely to run off, therefore questioned the necessity of handcuffs. No physical threat to the officer was deemed by some. Others disagreed.
- Some didn't consider her a threat other than her verbal abuse given how many officers were around. Force explained that where it isn't anticipated that there was a violent threat, there would not have been so many officers around. The presence of so many people suggested that they perceived a risk of violence. Force explained that propensity for violence often informs the number of police officers.
- Could she have been cuffed within the station? Yes, she could, but then she would have had to have been moved to a contained space. For practical reasons they would have kept her outside.
- She came to hand herself in, why was she was outside? Force explained you have to be invited into some stations where they are not permanently open. Request for privacy could have been addressed. Technically they could have done but it's very small space.
- The force was proportionate. The way her aggression escalated showed that the UoF was necessary.

**RAG rating:**

6 Green  
1 Amber

**Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:**

All queries raised by panel members were addressed by the Constabulary. Panel members were reminded of the importance for giving their own independent rating of the BWV in order to accurately capture the findings of the room.

No issues raised with this incident and overall the comments and RAG rating of the panel members reflects this.

**Actions arising:**

**Feedback:**

<i>Why was the officer in black not wearing a collar number?</i>	
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

Incident 2			
Review Date:	23/05/2024	BWV reference:	UF/1090816036/64
Incident Date:	24/08/2023	Incident time:	00:24

<b>Background Information:</b>
Subject seen near boats, shining a torch, late at night

<b>Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident (please complete if applicable): N/A</b>
N/A

<b>Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It seems he approached in a threatening manner and officer kicked him away. You don't know what's in his other hand. Some thought it may have been self-defence for why the subject ended up on the floor.</li> <li>• Officer said he couldn't get a hard copy of the search report but did not explain that you could get it in a hard copy if he went to a station. Feeling was that situation could have been slightly appeased by offering this.</li> <li>• Some felt the officer wound the subject up. A lot of sarcasm in tone. Name calling and other behaviour that was not professional. Calling him a wierdo and 'make a complaint then' were not helping to placate the subject.</li> <li>• Single crewing was questioned, and this was explained that it isn't always possible to double crew.</li> <li>• Police officers attitude was very sarcastic in tone. There were some name callings</li> </ul>

that were not right. Not very professional behaviour.

- Another bystander came in and the officer had the same tone with them.
- Attitude did not help the situation and escalated the situation. He could have spoken better to try and deescalate the situation.
- In agreement with planter, but issues with attitude of the officer.

**RAG rating:**

1 Green  
6 Amber

**Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:**

The panel members comments and RAG rating accurately reflect the conversation that took place around this incident. It is essential for this information to be fed back to the officer for their consideration and future learning.

**Actions arising:**

**Feedback:**

Feedback to the officer about his language and tone.

**Name:**

**Date:**

**Incident 3**

Review Date:	23/05/2024	BWV reference:	UF/2917488178/3
Incident Date:	5/7/2023	Incident time:	22:49

**Background Information:**

Subject had been to funeral and had too much to drink. He has returned to partners address, and they have had an argument. He has left with his partners car keys and taken the vehicle. *He returns to the address where officers attempt to arrest him and male tries to run.*

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

N/A

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

- Hard to tell how he was being restrained as a lot of the BWV was of the road.
- He requested to sit up a lot – is there a reason he wasn't allowed to sit up for so long? The force explained that he won't have been allowed until the officers believed he was under control.
- Additional officer that arrived late and stood with his hands in his pockets who kicked his legs away and asked him to stop kicking could have just stepped back instead of engaging and antagonising.
- PAVA was used but subject was offered water to wash his eyes after he was arrested.
- Do they need to use PAVA while someone is on the floor?
- Subject declared he was Type 1 diabetic – could this explain the rage/anger if he had blood sugar issues?
- There were a lot of officers, was this too many? Confirmed by force that there isn't guidance on how many is too many. It is discretion. High number could have been intimidating and not helped the situation. They could have backed away whilst waiting for van. Lots around in a circle.
- Subject was helped to use his inhaler.
- At first planter seemed ok. When there were 7 officers it seemed excessive as the initial 3 did seem to be handling it well. One officer did seem to kick the subject. All other officers handled it well and it seemed proportionate.
- Sometimes officers could be a bit more attentive and patient as the subject did what he said he would when they afforded the time to the subject.
- Force questioned use of officer language. Panel says this is fed back all the time and felt the language was very unprofessional.
- A different approach by the officers from the off could have changed the whole tone of the incident potentially. Not all agree, but it is a point for consideration.
- Could officers have approached in a less aggressive manner, maybe with the help of the subjects partner?
- There was discussion around shining of the torch in the subjects eyes and face that it was thought that this inflamed the situation.

**RAG rating:**

4 Green  
3 Amber

<b>Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:</b>	
The panel commented on the use of officer language which has arisen a number of times at panel meetings now. Although not raised as an action within the meeting by the Vice Chair, I am going to suggest that this is added as an action for the force to come back to us on what is being done, if anything, regarding language used in interactions with members of the public.	
<b>Actions arising:</b>	<b>Feedback:</b>
<b>Need to identify the officer who kicked the subject. That seemed unnecessary.</b>	
<b>Proposed action: what is the force stance on language used with subjects and what is being done internally to address this where there are concerns?</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

<b>Incident 4</b>			
Review Date:	23/05/2024	BWV reference:	UF/0744834696/17
Incident Date:	8/10/23	Incident time:	15:20

<b>Background Information:</b>
Reports received by police of on-going domestic at the location. Informant stated they could hear a male and female arguing and screaming at each other. They also stated they could hear smashing and doors slamming.

<b>Additional Body Worn Video - from other attending officers at incident (please complete if applicable): N/A</b>
--

N/A
-----

<b>Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:</b>
--

Not complete – BWV issue and time didn't allow.
---

<b>RAG rating:</b>	N/A
--------------------	-----

<b>Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:</b>
---

N/A
-----

<b>Actions arising:</b>	<b>Feedback:</b>
-------------------------	------------------

N/A	N/A
-----	-----

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
--------------	--------------