

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel

Custody Detention Capture Document



Panel date:	27/07/2025
Number of panel members in attendance:	4 Did not reach quorate. OPCC decision taken to proceed with the meeting. OPCC will have a focus on recruitment, retention and attendance of panel members later this year.
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Inspector Darren Gore (DG), Detective Superintendent Dan Quigley (DQ), Caitlin Bones (CB),</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Helen Chesterfield (HC)</i>
Previous Minutes and Actions	<p>Previous minutes were agreed.</p> <p>Action 1 Constabulary to feedback to local authority re the need for secure accommodation. This has been highlighted to the Youth Justice Board, as a finding from the Community Scrutiny Panel, that there is a need for a secure PACE bed locally. There has been no update yet from the local authority, but it would be their decision. For context, there is a national shortage of secure PACE bed provision.</p> <p>Action 2 OPCC to consider how they can support / address the lack of secure accommodation in Cambridgeshire. This has been escalated to the Senior Policy Officer for progression now she is back from Maternity Leave.</p>
Date of next meeting	28th August 2025 – Use of Force

Section 40 Inspector Reviews

PACE section 40 requires that the detention of an arrested person must be reviewed by a police officer of at least the rank of Inspector no later than 6 hours after detention was first authorised. The review officer must not have been directly involved in the investigation. The review can be carried out by means of a discussion, conducted by telephone, with one or more persons at the police station where the arrested person is held. The second review must be no later than 9 hours after the first and all subsequent reviews should be at 9-hour intervals.

The custody leadership team, review 30 S40 PACE reviews per month for compliance.

They look at –

- Was the review conducted on time?
- Was the review conducted more than 1 hour early?
- Was the review conducted in person?
- Was the DP asleep or in interview?
- Was the DP reminded of their right to free and independent legal advice?
- Did the review cover welfare considerations?
- Has any reference been made to case progression?
- Are there any safeguarding concerns?

DG explained that 60 out of approximately 800 custody records are subject to quality assurance checks each month (20 male, 20 female and 20 Juvenile). Half are S40 reviews.

RAG Rating explanation was shared with the panel.

- Green = Good, courteous engagement with detainee, Reminded of all relevant information.
- Amber = Good, courteous engagement with detainee. Reminded of most of the relevant information but missed some.
- Red = Uncourteous engagement with the detainee. Missed a lot of the information relevant to the review process.

A conversation was had surrounding the proposal being considered to introduce Secure end-to-end in-cell screens to allow videoconferencing (between Detainees, Custody Supervisors or Custody Professionals) at the new custody facility in Milton. There is also consideration being given to introducing a tablet device for Thorpe wood to enable some of this functionality (for reviews and showing information guides). Where a Sec 40 review

would be undertaken via this method it would be classed as a face-to-face review
ACTION – Constabulary to consider how interactions with DPs would be recorded (as in CCTV or in-call recording) if in-cell / iPad equivalent screens were introduced to allow for scrutiny.

Entry 2616

Review Date & Time: 16th July 2025 @ 14.49

Time of Arrest: 15th July 2025 @ 22.00

Time of Arrival at Custody: 23.08

Subject Information: White (British), Male, 14 years old

First review conducted at 05.09hrs when detainee asleep. This is his second review.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

DG - The Force duty manager was abstracted elsewhere. A Custody Inspector happened to be at the cell block and undertook the review.

Panel member commented - All relevant questions were asked, and information was given. Detainee requested shower and fresh air.

Panel member commented - Excellent demonstration of an Inspector S40 review

RAG rating:	Green – 4 Amber – 0 Red – 0
--------------------	-----------------------------------

Chairs Comments:

OPCC Summary:	Good, courteous engagement with DP. DP was reminded of all relevant information. Panel was content with what they were shown, and all RAG scored the interaction Green.
----------------------	---

Actions arising:

Feedback:

N/A

Entry 2269

Review Date & Time: 23rd June 2025 @ 06.22

Time of Arrest: 22nd June 2025 @ 23.59

Time of Arrival at Custody: 00.12	
Subject Information: White (British), Female, 42 years old	
This is the detainees first review.	
Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:	
Video wasn't clear to hear - Decided not to review	
RAG rating:	N/A
Chairs Comments:	
OPCC Summary:	Decision taken not to review this record as the audio was too difficult to decipher.
Actions arising:	Feedback:
N/A	

Entry 1977	
Review Date & Time: 3rd June 2025 @ 11.24	
Time of Arrest: 3rd June 2025 @ 04.51	
Time of Arrival at Custody: 05.03	
Subject Information: White (British), Male, 15 years old	
This is the detainees first review.	
Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:	
<p>Panel member commented that the body language of the Inspector was not encouraging for a teenager, he looked like he didn't want to be there.</p> <p>Panel member commented - Apart from not being offered shower and book I was satisfied that the interaction was good.</p> <p>Panel member commented – The Inspector explained all the different outcomes, but is this too much information for a teenager?</p> <p>Overall panel was satisfied that the DP was reminded of all the relevant information, and the Inspector was courteous.</p>	
RAG rating:	Green – 4 Amber – 0 Red – 0
Chairs Comments:	

OPCC Summary:	Good, courteous engagement with DP. DP was reminded of all relevant information. Panel was content with what they were shown, and all RAG scored the interaction Green.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:	
N/A		

Entry 2210		
Review Date & Time: 19th June 2025 @ 07.43		
Time of Arrest: 19th June 2025 @ 01.19		
Time of Arrival at Custody: 01.34		
Subject Information: White (Latvian), Female, 40 years old		
This is the detainees first review.		
Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:		
<p>Panel observed it was tricky to hear the sound on the recording, however thought they heard enough to be able to review.</p> <p>Panel member commented - Apart from not being offered shower and exercise I was satisfied that the interaction was good.</p> <p>Panel member commented that the Inspector gave the DP plenty of time to process and respond to the questions.</p>		
RAG rating:	Green – 4 Amber – 0 Red – 0	
Chairs Comments:		
OPCC Summary:	Good, courteous engagement with DP. DP was reminded of all relevant information. Panel was content with what they were shown, and all RAG scored the interaction Green.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:	
N/A		

Entry 2290**Review Date & Time: 24th June 2025 @ 18.40****Time of Arrest: 24th June 2025 @ 11.02****Time of Arrival at Custody: 11.42****Subject Information: White (British), Male, 17 years old****This is the detainees first review.****Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:**

Panel member pointed out – why was this entry not recorded as a late review? It doesn't feel right for why it took an hour to book in this juvenile.

Chair explained that the recent HMIC report picked up the number of sleeping reviews was far more than they would expect. The review was conducted at 18:40. The panel observed that the Inspector should have tried harder to wake the DP.

The written record reads as though the DP had been spoken with. Which is not what the CCTV shows.

Panel member commented that this was hugely concerning as it is not an accurate reflection of the interaction.

Panel member said they were lost for words, the written record does not seem to match reality, which is a serious misrepresentation

RAG rating:

Green – 0
Amber – 0
Red – 4

Chairs Comments:

The panel were concerned that they read a detailed written record of a discussion that did not happen. The CCTV clearly showed the detainee was asleep.

OPCC Summary:

The written record did not reflect the interaction which should have been recorded as a sleeping review.

Actions arising:**Feedback:**

<p>ACTION for constabulary to look why this was not recorded as a late review and/or if the review was not late why did it take an hour for the juvenile to be booked in.</p> <p>ACTION – Constabulary to take advice from PSD as to next steps as this written record did not reflect the interaction.</p>	
---	--

Entry 2270	
<p>35NT/2270/25 31 year old Nigerian, male Arrested on 23/06/2025 @ 02.45 Arrived in custody at 03.06 First and only review</p>	
<p>Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:</p> <p>Panel members thought it was a good interaction with the detainee, and a two-way discussion was had. The Inspector showed concern for the DP who hadn't eaten, although food was given.</p>	
<p>RAG rating:</p>	<p>Green – 4 Amber – 0 Red – 0</p>
<p>Chairs Comments:</p>	
<p>OPCC Summary:</p>	<p>Good, courteous engagement with DP. DP was reminded of all relevant information. Panel was content with what they were shown, and all RAG scored the interaction Green.</p>
<p>Actions arising:</p>	<p>Feedback:</p>
<p>N/A</p>	

Further Actions

ACTION - Constabulary to consider seeking benchmarking data from other forces regarding timeliness of reviews and percentage of reviews that are late.