

Stop and Search Capture Document

Panel date:	11/12/2025
Number of panel members in attendance:	20 panel members including the vice chair
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Colin Norden (CN), Caitlin Bones (CB)</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Matilda Pearson (MP), Charlie Murfitt (CM)</i>
Agenda item 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New panel members introduced themselves along with members of the Constabulary and OPCC. • The minutes from the previous meeting in September were signed off as true and accurate. • Actions from the previous meeting were completed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide more information if available following newspaper article regarding PCC comments that officers lack confidence in Stop Search. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No additional information is present and there have been no further articles about this. ❖ The force response as given at the last meeting remains. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feedback to officers regarding the switching on of their BWV. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Given as part of individual feedback to officer. ○ Feedback to officers on quality and content of grounds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Given as part of individual feedback to officer. ○ Force to consider if female (or male) officers in stations should be deployed to search to avoid cross-sex searching. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ On-going discussions – will be brought in full to January Police Powers Meeting ○ Use of evidence bags / Clarification on whether plain clothed officers carry a warrant card / Reconsidering whether the suspect should have been arrested. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ A review of this stop and search by the officer’s line management is underway but has not yet been fully completed due to officer abstraction, annual leave etc.

	<p>A panel member asked for clarification on the term 'abstraction'. CB: This is where an officer has been deployed to carry out an alternative role to what they usually do. Examples are that they may have been sent out of force or a neighbourhood officer has been sent to cover response.</p> <p>Reminder of jewellery permitted per the force policy especially in public order policing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ CB attended recent PSU Briefings and confirmed there is still no slide but it is often mentioned by Bronze (Inspector) Commanders, however, this is dependent on the Commander. ❖ CB has followed up with Supt. Kerridge and Ops Support/Planning who make the PSU briefings – proposed slide shown to panel members for information.
<p>Agenda item 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The theme for this meeting is section 1 PACE searches for bladed articles • CB provided information on Stop Search Data for November 2025. There were 147 stop and searches, of these: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 46 were under s1 PACE 1984 ○ 23 were where the object of the search was for a bladed article. 2 offensive weapons were also available for video selection. ○ 13 were cross-gender stop searches. ○ Ethnicity was broken down as: Asian – 4 / Black - 2 / White – 19 ○ The majority of the searches occurred in Peterborough and were incident related <p>-A panel member asked about the high number of 'nothing found' following a search. CB: Although the find rate in Cambridgeshire is high, a high number of stop searches also result in nothing found. Bladed article searches are quite often intelligence based. If the Constabulary has received reports of somebody with a knife, they are duty bound to investigate this and take action, this quite often</p>

	<p>results in a stop search. On occasions, the informant may have been mistaken and therefore it is these searches that can result in nothing found.</p> <p>-Is there a reason why Peterborough appears to have the highest number of stop searches? CB: There could be a range of different reasons for this. Peterborough has the largest population in Cambridgeshire and therefore this could be a contributing factor.</p> <p>-Why was No Further Action (NFA) not 20 (instead of 16) if Nothing Found was 20. CB: The subject may have had other offences outstanding. Although a bladed article was not found on them, it may be that they have missed a court date or breached an order. The data provided in the PowerPoint showed that the number of Find – Not Linked was 4 which means the remaining 16 were NFA's.</p>
Agenda item 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summary of BWV viewing can be read below.
AOB & Date of next meeting	<p>Vehicle Stops at Cambs HQ on Thursday 15th January 2026</p> <p>Custody at Cambs HQ on Thursday 29th January 2026</p> <p>Use of Force on Teams Thursday 26th February 2026</p> <p>Stop and Search at Cambs HQ Thursday 26th March 2026</p>

Incident 1			
Review Date:	11/12/2025	BWV reference:	SS/4033131869/3
Incident Date:	04/11/2025	Incident time:	18:20

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: Young male declares he might be in possession of a knife and shows a catapult to staff. Officers search the subject and find offensive weapons.

Comments:

- The panel were satisfied with the quality of the grounds.

Grounds RAG rating:**Green:** 21 = 100%**Amber:****Red:****Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:**

- Officers handled the situation well
- It was confirmed that no Use of Force was required
- Very professional engagement by the officers
- GOWISELY was completed apart from the warrant card
- It was refreshing to see the subject also engage positively with the officers
- Very professional conduct from the officers
- A panel member commented that this the best BWV they had viewed
- Professionally handled
- No issues
- One panel member asked for clarity around the circumstances in which the police were called as the grounds stated that the subject declared the catapult at reception which was why the police were called however the video seemed to show a different sequence of events. **CB:** When the subject arrived at the location, they informed staff that they were in possession of a catapult and may also have a knife. Officers were called and spoke to staff, who have given a description of the subject. The BWV then shows the officers locating the subject and detaining them for the purposes of a stop search.
- The subject did not threaten staff but declared possession of the items anyway, if the subject had not done this, staff would have been none the wiser, police would not have been called, and the subject could have carried on about his daily business without intervention.
- The subject could have been bragging about the knife
- Very well done by the officers. The second officer placed himself strategically several times in anticipation of any unexpected movements.
- Did officers arrest the subject as soon as they found the catapult as it was found first?
CB: The catapult and knife were found in close succession so it is likely that the officer continued with the search to see if the outcome would be any different. In situations like this, it will be down to officer discretion.
- The officers used common sense

- **MP:** Another consideration for panel members could be around whether use of force should have been used, in their opinion? For example, do they feel ok about the fact that handcuffs have not been used?
- Panel members were satisfied that handcuffs were not used. The officer also informed the subject that he would not be handcuffing at that time.
- The searching officer used gloves for the search however the second officer did not, yet they handled evidence and assisted in placing items in the evidence bag. **CB:** Officers carrying out the search are required to wear gloves for their own safety and that of the detainee. Best practice would be for the second officer to also wear gloves if they are handling anything belonging to the detainee.
- **CN:** There were certain elements of the stop search that raise questions, such as the lack of use of gloves by the second officer but also the attentiveness of the second officer. In addition, the searching officer has stated that the subject is being arrested to prevent harm, however they do not handcuff him despite a bladed article being found in the search.
- Both officers seemed quite young. **CB:** The officers are the standard age for response officers.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 21 = 100%	Amber:	Red:
----------------------------	-------------------------	---------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
All panel members were in agreement with the rating of this SS. The Constabulary supported where necessary by explaining some of the questions that the panel had.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
None	N/A
Name:	Date:

Incident 2			
Review Date:	11/12/2025	BWV reference:	SS/1056698309/1

Incident Date:	04/11/2025	Incident time:	23:36
----------------	------------	----------------	-------

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: A Member of Public (MOP) has reported a male suspect in possession of a knife and making threats to kill. A chase has ensued between the MoP and suspect.			
Comments:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions of a flick knife and flip knife were given to the panel. • Were the MOPs in contact with the subject until the police arrived. CB: The MOPs were not with the subject when the police located them. • Is it known the time between the call being made to the police and the officers arriving. CB: We don't have the exact number of minutes it took for officers to respond, but due to the subject still being in the area when officers arrived, it suggests that the response was fast. • Is there any significance to the subject admitting having been chased. CB: Officers are able to have conversations with subjects without having to caution them. There was no knife found during the search, and as there is no evidential chain, admitting to being chased will not have any implications. CN: By the subject admitting to being chased by an MOP, it helps officers establish whether they are stopping and searching the person that has been reported. 			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 21 = 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CB: After the search is complete, officers take statements from the MOPs who reported the subject to the police. Due to making threats to the MOPs, the subject is arrested for this offence. • The use of handcuffs seemed unnecessary. CN: The report stated that the subject was carrying a knife and when officers arrived, the subject was agitated therefore using handcuffs would be appropriate. • The number of officers in attendance seemed excessive. If this footage was compared to previous incidents, there are usually only two or three officers attending. 			

- GOWISELY was not given in its entirety. The officer attempted to explain the reason for the search but stopped as the subject was agitated.
- It is understandable why GOWISELY may not have been followed due to the difficulty in communicating along with the agitated state of the subject. The officers did still give the grounds, legal power and explained that if the search did not find anything, they would be free to go at the end.
- The use of handcuffs is interesting when compared to the incident viewed earlier where handcuffs were not used. Although it is likely they were used on this occasion due to safety.
- Did the officer explain to the subject that he was being handcuffed for the purposes of a stop search, as it seemed that the officers handcuffed the subject immediately with no explanation.
- The subject may have been aggravated due to the officer threatening to use a taser. The officer seemed unnecessarily aggressive throughout the interaction.
- Why were there so many police officers? **CN:** As the report was of a person with a knife, force control room will have dispatched as many resources as possible so as to apprehend the subject as soon as possible. Once the subject has been detained however, that would be an appropriate time to reduce the number of officers involved. In this situation, a single officer talking to the subject would have been advisable as there were too many distractions for the subject calm down and made de-escalation challenging.
- The professionalism displayed by officers in this incident and the previous incident was equal. There were many differences between the two, such as location, behaviour of the subject, the latter incident being in a poorly lit area.
- The amount of police on scene was alarming. There did not appear to be a need for so many police officers, especially as the officers talking to the subject were in control. It could have made the subject even more overwhelmed in that situation.
- The officers handcuffed the subject without a proper explanation and the mention of the taser at first contact seemed without reason as the subject was not resisting.
- The handcuffing seemed necessary. However, the number of officers was excessive. The previous incident reviewed had similar reports of a person with a knife, however only two officers were dispatched, yet this incident was attended by approximately eight officers. This could have contributed to the subject's frustrations.
- It took the officers a while to explain to the subject that he would be released if they

found nothing during the search.

- The subject stated that he was an asylum seeker with indefinite leave to remain. This may have been a contributing factor to their reaction when they were detained as they may have been concerned that if they were arrested, they would lose their indefinite leave to remain status. If officers had reassured him earlier, he may not have reacted in the way he did. The agitation and the raised voice may have been because English is not the subjects first language.
- A discussion took place around language barriers, such as English not being a person's first language. A common misconception is that a person may be using a raised voice because they are agitated or aggravated but it may actually be as a result of them becoming frustrated that they cannot convey something as well as they want, because of an accent or the language barrier.
- Officers were patient with a very agitated person.
- In the first incident reviewed, the officers clearly identified themselves and gave the subject their rights. In this incident, the first interaction is the officer informing the subject that they have a taser therefore this would cause the subject to be alarmed immediately. Their approach on this occasion is concerning.
- Due to the absence of GOWISELY, this incident should be rated as amber as protocols should be followed at all times.
- It is significant in this case to be aware that the knife attack on the train at Huntingdon had occurred only three days prior to this incident. The officers attending this incident were unaware of what lay ahead and therefore it is unsurprising that they dealt with the incident with a degree of caution.
- The subject responded calmly and quietly to the female officer and therefore a rapport could have been developed with this officer rather than continuing with the male officer.
- The lead officer appeared to be focussed mainly on compliance, which is understandable at the outset, however once the subject was handcuffed, the attitude of the officer did not change or any attempt made in engagement. The engagement came from supporting officers, particularly the female officer, and there did appear to be any efforts made to de-escalate the situation to bring it to a conclusion.
- Rag rating this incident as amber, minimum rapport was attempted but did not help in the de-escalation of the situation. There were an excessive number of officers after handcuffing which was not necessary.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 5 = 25%	Amber: 15 = 75%	Red:
----------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

I think there were a couple of things that contributed to the majority rating of amber. Panel members did not seem satisfied with the number of officers in attendance and felt that once detained and no weapon found, some officers leaving would have helped the situation and calmed the subject. They also felt that there were minimum efforts to build rapport and GOWISELY was not fully covered.

It would be helpful if the Constabulary could take this feedback and consider what the expectation is regarding officers leaving a situation once it is under control.

Actions arising:	Feedback:
None	The Constabulary take's the comments on board regarding expectation of officers leaving a situation once under control. There is no specific policy on this as it is for individual officers on scene to assess the threat, risk and harm (or possible harm) of the incident continuously. However, the force would not expect officers to remain if the situation is fully under control and there are no tasks for the officers. Nonetheless, whilst the male remained at the water side there would have posed a greater risk, though it has been fed back to officers involved that a dedicated contact officer who communicates is more helpful in such situations and officer can remain on scene but not in the immediate suspect vicinity to aid a singular point of communication.

Name: Caitlin Bones	Date: 28/01/26
----------------------------	-----------------------

Incident 3

Review Date:	11/12/2025	BWV reference:	SS/1539968976/9
Incident Date:	07/11/2025	Incident time:	22:28

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: Searching for a high-risk missing person, officers at Peterborough train station have located the subject and taken them outside of the train station. Information was then received suggesting the subject was in possession of a knife and drugs and therefore a stop search was performed.			
Comments:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clear and concise • Well written and informative. Painted a picture clearly. 			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 20 = 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPO - Police Protection Order. If the subject is under the age of 18 years old and at significant risk, they can be taken into PPO which can be for up to 72 hours. The police will notify social services who will formulate a plan for next steps which could be the safe return of the young person to their home, or it could be an application for an emergency court order for the young person to go elsewhere. • Do young people know what PPO means, as many adults would not know the definition. CN: The law states that a PPO should be explained to young people. • The subject or any young person would not have known what a PPO meant so it was perhaps inappropriate use. • Police acronyms should not be used when explaining the reason for detention. • The interaction was fine, however the presence of the female officer did not feel necessary. • Although drugs were found in the subject's the bag, the officers did not appear to address this. CB: The officers did locate a bottle of a class A substance however they took no further action at that time and the outcome was placing the subject under a

PPO.

- The officers explained themselves well and the search was conducted well. Officers should be mindful of using acronyms especially to children as they would not know why they are being detained. Aside from this, the officers were authoritative whilst being polite and trying to build rapport.
- Who arranges how the young person gets back to their home, is it social services or the police? **CN:** If the young person lives at home, it is likely to be the parent however if this is not a possibility, social services may make arrangements. However, the police may also return the young person due to this being a faster resolution.
- Would the subject have been stopped and searched if there had not been mention of a knife? **CN:** Initially, the officers were just searching for a high-risk missing person. The search only takes place due to the officers receiving further information that the subject may have a knife in their possession, and it is at this point a stop search is carried out. This is for the safety of the officers and the subject. Although a knife was not found, class A drugs were, however arrest at this point may have felt disproportionate therefore it is likely a crime will be raised and dealt with separately.
- The officers followed GOWISELY.
- The drugs and PPO could have been explained in clearer terms.
- The officer had a good rapport
- Although the footage does not show when the additional information was received which made the officers carry out the stop search, they did explain they were going to carry this out prior to commencement.
- Is taking the subject back to their home address not taking them back to the danger of which they fled? **CN:** The subject could have been sent to this location for a number of different purposes and therefore the danger might not be just where they have travelled from. A full risk assessment will be completed before a decision is made as to where that person will need to be taken in order to keep them safe. This will assess whether there is a risk to life and if so, that person would not be returned to where they came from, but be taken to a place of safety.
- They are safeguarding the subject which has been well executed.
- Is there a reason why additional officers joined the two who were searching the subject as they appeared to have the situation under control. **CB:** The male officers were on response therefore they have joined the search for the missing high-risk person, however it was the female officers who were performing the initial search and

may have had additional PPO information.			
Overall RAG rating:	Green: 20 = 100%	Amber:	Red:

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
No comments regarding the S&S from the OPCC. However, it would be reassuring to know whether something was definitely done regarding the possession of drugs labelled for someone else.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
None	<i>In relation to the comments regarding whether something was done regarding the Class A substance found. As stated at the panel, no action was taken at the time about the bottle of Class A substance, rather a safeguarding approach was prioritised to place the young person on a PPO. This was the outcome of the incident, and no further action would be taken later regarding the drugs. Though note the drugs would have been seized to be destroyed and not given back to the young person.</i>
Name: Caitlin Bones	Date: 28/01/26

Incident 4			
Review Date:	11/12/2025	BWV reference:	SS/1603913625/2
Incident Date:	28/11/2025	Incident time:	15:44

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: A female has contacted a partner agency stating they are in possession of a knife and that they are going to take their own life. Officers are dispatched to their last

known location however the female has reportedly returned home, therefore officers attend the home address.

Comments:

- The grounds are well written.
- The time on the summary slide is 00:00 however the grounds state 15:44. **CB:** The default time on the system is 00:00 therefore the officer has omitted to change this on the system. The BWV shows the time as 15:44.
- Is it possible a mobile phone was mistaken for a knife? **CN:** This mistake is commonly made.
- The ambulance service was not referenced prior to the end of the grounds, what is the reason for this? **CB:** The end of the grounds is usually the summary of the search as a whole. The partner agency that made the 999 call which is referenced at the beginning of the grounds was most likely the ambulance service or possibly the mental health services. At the start of the BWV, the ambulance service are also in attendance with the police therefore this will have been a multi-agency response. **CN:** Previously, members of the public would have been detained under s136 of the Mental Health Act and subsequently kept in custody for up to 72 hours for assessment by a medical professional. Current practice is now to transfer members of the public to the ambulance service without being held in a cell or visiting a police station at all. In addition, an NHS mental health nurse is crewed with an officer, and they are dispatched to incidents which potentially involve mental health. **CN** added that in his opinion, these changes are some of the best things that have been done in policing.
- It would be interesting to know what it was that looked like a knife mentioned in the grounds.

Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 20 = 100%	Amber:	Red:
----------------------------	-------------------------	---------------	-------------

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Could a mobile phone have been what was mistaken for a knife as this was the only item found in the subject's pockets.
- Who is responsible if a detainee's property gets damaged? **CN:** If an officer is responsible, the force would take responsibility and advise the detainee to submit a claim to recover costs.

- The officer was quite abrupt when explaining their rights.
- Should officers state the three methods by which a subject can obtain a copy of their search as they were only advised of being able to go to a police station to obtain this. **CB:** Officers must inform a subject that they are entitled to a copy of the search, and it is best practice to explain the methods of how to do this.
- The hood on the subject's clothing appeared to be bulging at the back however the officer did not search this. **CN:** It is expected that officers will check the hood during a search.
- The subject can be heard stating that they left the knife at home.
- An amber vote would be appropriate due to not searching the hood.
- GOWISELY was followed however the search was not carried out particularly thoroughly.
- Is it acceptable that the officers did not identify themselves until after the subject was handcuffed. **CB:** Handcuffs can be used initially if needed.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 17 = 85%	Amber: 3 = 15%	Red:
----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
I consider the amber rating from the panel to be a result of the panel considering the initial approach a bit abrupt, the search not being completely thorough, and some members had concerns for the safety of the subjects' possessions which were dropped.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
None	Individual feedback was given to the officers involved regarding the Chair's comments, especially in regard to caring for detainee's property. The force does not consider this to be a wider issue but learning for individual officers.
Name: Caitlin Bones	Date: 28/01/26