

Use of Force Minutes

Panel date:	25 February 2026
Number of panel members in attendance:	13 panel members (one member left before the 4 th incident)
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Caitlin Bones, Inclusion & Legitimacy Co-ordinator (CB), Sergeant Sean Feline (SF)</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Matilda Pearson, Senior Policy Officer (MP)</i>
Agenda Item 1	<p>Previous Minutes and Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The panel agreed the minutes for the previous use of force scrutiny meeting. Previous action for the constabulary: Update Public Order Briefings with uniform policy reminding of information jewellery etc. Response: This was fed back and noted that it was verbally given at the next MBR acres protest but not on a slide. Panel asked for it to be included on a slide – Supt. Steve Kerridge is aware and will ensure this is included by the Ops Planning Department. Previous action for the OPCC: Find out if/when officers will receive the previously discussed mental health training. MP updated that SLT are aware but there is not a straightforward answer as there are resourcing things to be discovered.
Agenda Item 2	<p>Scrutiny Theme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective of this meeting was to scrutinise police officer’s use of force that has been linked to Acute Behavioural Disturbance (ABD). A presentation was given at the start of the meeting in order familiarise panel members with what ABD is.

Agenda Item 3	<p>Use of Force Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the 941 use of force forms in January 2026, 18 were found where the officer selected ABD as one of their impact factors which relate to 9 separate individuals. • 1 of these didn't have BWV available, but that was because it was in a custody block and there was CCTV recording throughout. • Of these 9 incidents, 6 resulted in hospitalisation with 1 other being returned to a medical setting where they were an in-patient so 7 hospitalised as such • All incidents where multiple officers selected ABD were hospitalised, of the 2 not hospitalised in these only one officer had selected ABD whereas other present had not.
Agenda Item 4	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed to extend the next Vehicle Stop panel (Tuesday 19th May 2026) to run 18:30-21:00hrs to allow for a show-and-tell around police vehicles and their tasking requirements, as asked at the last vehicle stop panel. • It was agreed to extend the next Use of Force panel (Thursday 25th June 2026) to run 18:00-21:00hrs, if an input by Officer Safety Training Team can be arranged for the first hour. • It will be explored if the panel can visit the new Milton Custody Suite prior to it opening. CB will discuss this with the custody team.
Date of next meeting	19 th March 2026 – Stop and Search (MS Teams)

Incident 1

Review Date:	31 January 2026	BWV reference:	Entry UF/0240379573/2
--------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------------

Background Information:

The initial report is a concern for a male screaming and walking in the middle of the road. Officers recognise the subject is showing signs of an ABD episode. The subject has

previously presented to police with similar signs having suffered ABD in the past. Officers attempt to contain the male in a garden without touching him until an ambulance and/or more officers arrive. The subject leaves the garden and walks towards a member of the public's car and tries getting into the driver's door at which point officers use a ground restraint and handcuffing to restrain him until ambulance and more officers arrive. Once ambulance arrives, they assist in lifting him onto a stretcher using the stretcher seatbelts to restrain him and he is then removed to hospital in the ambulance.

Outcome: Hospitalised

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Neither police or ambulance are recognised as such by the subject
- It is a difficult theme for a non-medic, has the subject previously shown symptoms of ABD? **CB** explained that from the information we know the officers have had previous interactions with the subject where he presented with ABD. We appreciate it is a difficult subject, as it is for officers because they too are not medical professionals.
- Repetitive shouting of 'help me'... it felt like there wasn't enough reassurance that the ambulance was coming and that they were trying to help the person. Feels as though there is more that someone could have been done to reassure. The Chair defended this by saying the officers acted appropriately for this condition.
- The Chair commented that more people speaking would have confused the matter. Others agreed that only one officer talking was a useful approach.
- Why did the officers leave it so long before using force? It felt as though there was a lot of potential for additional risk before he was restrained. **CB** explained that there were only two officers present at the time, and restraint of someone in this condition would have taken more resource and so they would have been waiting for more resource or until it was unavoidable to restrain, which occurred when the subject tried to enter the car.

RAG rating:

Green (13)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Panel members found that the explained symptoms of ABD were present in this incident and found that the officers proceeded accordingly. Panellists commended officers for their handling of this incident and asked for that to be fed back.

Actions arising:	Constabulary Feedback:
N/A	Panel comments have been fed back to involved officers.
Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 09/03/2026

Incident 2			
Review Date:	1 January 2026	BWV reference:	Entry UF/0047503357/31

Background Information:

As soon as officers entered the reception, the subject raised a table above his head again and charged at the officers and members of staff. The officer stepped aside to avoid the table and drew her PAVA, deploying it in the subject's face. PAVA took effect immediately and he fell to his knees.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Hard to decipher whether it was ABD or not, but the officer reacted appropriately in the situation.
- Officers immediately made sure that others left the room and area to preserve the dignity of the man once he had been PAVA'd and was on the floor.
- There was concern for the officer's reaction to the PAVA and whether there is a recommended distance they should be when deploying. **SF** confirmed that as they were inside, splash back is sadly unavoidable.
- One panel member asked how the force felt about the use of PAVA? **CB** stated they were not there to influence the panel. **SF** confirmed it was good to see PAVA was considered quickly and said this is a good example of deployment, even with the splashback. No injury to the subject but subject was completely incapacitated and unable to cause further harm. **CB** confirmed that PAVA is considered a lower

level of force and one that training encourages officers to use over fighting etc. as that has an increased injury to officers.	
RAG rating:	Green (13)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
No concerns were raised regarding the use of force, more concern was expressed for the officer who was suffering the splash back from the PAVA. Panellists wanted to feed back that the officer handled this situation well and thought quickly.	
Actions arising:	Constabulary Feedback:
N/A	Panel comments have been fed back to involved officers.
Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 09/03/2026

Incident 3			
Review Date:	4 January 2026	BWV reference:	UF/2306638239/41

Background Information:
<p>The initial report of this incident reports a female who had been refused service by staff in a bar and had then gone outside and had been banging on the windows from outside. Security guards from the bar had then attempted to stop her and move her on when she had then started running into the road. The security guards then called police and attempted to restrain her.</p> <p>SF confirmed that the reason this incident starts with subject on the ground is because when officers arrived security already had her restrained on the ground.</p>

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was felt that the restraint was very necessary.

- One panel member asked whether any complaints had been received on this matter or not? **CB** confirmed that this information is not known as it is not assessed in preparation for the panel so as to not influence the panel is anyway.
- It was commented that it is hard to tell if this is ABD or not.
- One of the police officers seemed to be trying hard to keep calm and sensible and tried to level with the subject. **SF** explained that ABD is a form of psychosis, so they cannot be reasoned with so officers often end up repeating themselves
- Some concern around the fact that subject was complaining she was in pain with her shoulder, but the officers seemed dismissive of it and didn't try any alternative means of restraint at the time.

RAG rating:	Green (13)
--------------------	------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Panel members discussed whether this seemed to be ABD or not but recognise that is not what they are making a decision on.

Actions arising:

Constabulary Feedback:

N/A

Panel comments have been fed back to involved officers.

Name: Matilda Pearson

Date: 09/03/2026

Incident 4

Review Date:	26 January 2026	BWV reference:	UF/0332099672/118
--------------	-----------------	----------------	-------------------

Background Information:

The initial report relates to a white male attempting to break into the property via the garden, similar reports made at neighbouring addresses around the same time. Officers attend and engage with the male.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- One panel questioned whether the dog that can be heard is a police dog or not. **CB** confirmed that there is no record of a police dog, and it would have been expected there to be warnings given. Since, as soon as the dog comes out it is considered a use of force and there is no use of force form for a police dog associated with this incident. *A police dog was clearly seen later in the clip being held on its lead by its handler. **CB** will take this back and get JPS to provide clarification around this incident*
- The man appears to be injured but there didn't appear to be any effort from the officers to establish whether there were any injuries or not, despite the homeowners stating that he was.
- It didn't appear to be anything related to ABD.
- BWV dies before the end of this incident. A panel member asked if this should occur? **CB** confirmed that BWV should be able to last the full shift if they are fully charged as extensive testing has been done to confirm this. **CB** also confirmed that if there is an issue with the battery life of a BWV then it needs reporting and a replacement will be given from ICT.

RAG rating:

Green (12)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

There were a number of concerns with this incident regarding attention to detail (my interpretation). The lack of UoF form for the dog, lack of attempt to assess injury, BWV not lasting the duration of the incident.

A reminder needs to be given to this officer regarding the importance of starting a shift with a fully charged BWV.

Actions arising:

Constabulary Feedback:

<p>Constabulary to explore the fact that later in the incident a police dog was seen but there is not a use of force record for this.</p>	<p>This has been fed back to JPS, who oversee police dogs, and an update has been asked for prior to the next Use of Force Community Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>The officer has been reminded about the need to charge his BWV.</p>
<p>Name: Matilda Pearson</p>	<p>Date: 09/03/2026</p>

<p>Incident 5</p>			
<p>Review Date:</p>	<p>27 December 2025</p>	<p>BWV reference:</p>	<p>UF/1461050145/90</p>

<p>Background Information:</p>
<p>The subject was a high-risk missing person – a 17-year-old Section 3 patient at Fulbourn hospital. The subject had been self-harming by cutting her arms and was spotted by officers conducting area searches of Cambridge city.</p> <p>The first BWV gets cut short as it is believed that during the struggle it gets knocked into not recording. The second video, from the same officer, showed more of the incident, the officer appears to have turned it back on when they realised it was not working.</p>

<p>Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were a lot of concerns raised about the fact the officer was single crewed. A panel member asked about if single crewing also applied to female officers. SF confirmed it did. • The panel were concerned that a single officer having to restrain a lone female in a dark park was not a safe environment for anyone involved. • Communication with subject could have been better • Would have liked to hear them explaining more to her as to what they are doing, especially when moving her to the police vehicle. One panel member felt as if the officers were treating her a bit like she was not there. • Some panel members were not sure if a carry mat needed to be used or if more communication could have resolved the matter. 	
<p>RAG rating:</p>	<p>Amber (8 Amber and 4 Green)</p>

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
Overall panel members were concerned about the lack of communication and some didn't think it felt a safe situation for anyone involved, the amber rating is representative of the concerns over communication.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
N/A	Panel comments have been fed back to involved officers and will be fed into the Operational Legitimacy Meeting.
Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 09/03/2026