

Stop and Search Capture Document

Panel date:	19/03/2026
Number of panel members in attendance:	14 including the panel chair and vice chair
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Colin Norden, Caitlin Bones</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Michelle Lord, Charlotte Murfitt</i>
Agenda item 1 - Minutes and Actions from Previous Meeting	• The minutes from the previous meeting in December were signed off as true and accurate • There were no actions from the previous meeting.
Agenda item 2 – Stop Search Theme & Data	• The theme for this panel was Stop Searches by Student Officers • 186 stop searches in January 2026, of these, 26 completed by student officers. Further analysis showed however, that there were only 20 searches carried out by a student officer. • Of the 20 searches, these consisted of: ○ Person - 16 ○ Person & vehicle - 2 ○ Vehicle - 2 • Additional data was presented regarding how the stop was initiated, the find and the outcome, along with the age, sex and ethnicity of the subject. • For information, the number after the dash at the end of a reference number is the number of stop searches that officer has completed to date. The Chair declared there is a possibility that they may know some of the officers in footage to be scrutinised due to their role as a PSV.
Agenda item 3 – BWV Reviews	BWV was reviewed
Agenda Item 4 – AOB & Dates of next meeting	• AGM – 7th April at HQ • S & S – 23rd April at HQ • Vehicle – 19th May at HQ • Custody – 26th May on Teams

	• Milton Tour – 4th June – To be emailed separately • UoF – 25th June at HQ • Parking – To be addressed at the AGM.
--	---

Incident 1

Review Date:	19/03/2026	BWV reference:	SS/2313479274/2
Incident Date:	02/01/2026	Incident time:	16:49

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: Call received from CCTV operator at Longstanton Park and Ride regarding group of youths being rowdy.

Comments:

The panel were satisfied with the grounds.

Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 13 (100%)	Amber:	Red:
----------------------------	-------------------------	---------------	-------------

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Good rapport.
- The subject was very compliant.
- The officer introduced themselves clearly.
- The officer created a calm environment, there was no reason for tensions to be raised because of the way the officers conducted themselves.
- The officer didn't ask the subject if they had anything on them before they started the search.
- The officer left themselves vulnerable as they didn't ask if they had any objects on them that could harm anyone and the subject wasn't handcuffed for the search even though they were searching for a bladed article.
- The subject was a male and searched by a female. The officer should have asked the subject if they consented to being searched by a female as it is usual procedure for searches to be carried out by the same sex as the subject.

- The search may have been carried out by the female officer because they needed evidence for their student training. **CB:** This would increase the likelihood of why the female officer carried out the search however consent should still be sought.
- What is Section 1 of PACE? The subject wouldn't have known what that meant. **CB:** Provided clarification on PACE meaning, Police and Criminal Evidence Act.
- The subject was very polite and was compliant with the search.
- The officers are taught to handcuff on all occasions when searching for a knife. **CN:** It is likely that is what officers are advised. **CB:** The officer would have needed to justify the use of force and therefore may have not felt it necessary or justifiable.
- Handcuffing could mean extra paperwork.
- It is not law to handcuff, it is officer discretion.
- The atmosphere the officer created meant the subject didn't need to be defensive.
- Good communication.
- The officer was confident and should be commended.
- It would be advisable to use handcuffs.
- GOWISELY was fully delivered.
- Handcuffs should have been used as searching for a bladed article.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 12 (92%)	Amber: 1 (8%)	Red:
----------------------------	------------------------	----------------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:
	<i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i>
Name:	Date:

Incident 2			
Review Date:	19/03/2026	BWV reference:	SS/1060917041/78
Incident Date:	07/01/2026	Incident time:	

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: Call received alleging a male was using a hammer to try and gain entry into an address. Comments: The panel were satisfied with the grounds.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
• The officer gave a clear explanation as to why they were searching the subject. • Good communication throughout. • Caring approach by the officer. • The officer carrying out the search is a superstar. • The officer gave a clear explanation of themselves and the search. • The officer made sure the subject understood. • The interaction was exemplary. • The officer asked all necessary questions and performed the search carefully. • Were there any marks on the door from the hammer? CB: There doesn't appear to be any mention of marks on the door. • Did they find the hammer? CB: There is also no mention of a hammer being found. • The officers were alert and thorough, finding cash and then two mobile phones. • It was clear the officer was experienced. • Two phones is not necessarily suspicious but the cash added to suspicion. • It is not a crime to have more than one mobile phone, and the questioning seemed to be suggestive to begin with.

- The officer did not inform the subject of how long the search would be available for.
- The subject had two sets of car keys but couldn't recall the make/model of the cars. The officers had to obtain information from the female to find the car.
- An officer hit the subject with the car door.
- The officers clearly explained the process.
- The cash was too much to have therefore it was right for the officers to question the source.
- It was a reasonable question to ask why the subject had two phones.
- Feedback received before implied that police were immediately suspicious when a person had two mobile phones however many people do, such as for personal and work. However, with the addition of cash and two different cars, it was understandable that suspicion was raised on this occasion.
- People may have two phones for when they visit a different country and therefore need a different SIM card. The subject needs to be given the opportunity to explain the two phones as it could be innocent.
- **CN:** Officers will assess the situation and context of that situation when deciding on whether they should be suspicious, therefore on this occasion, with all the factors and evidence in front of them, it is likely suspicions would be raised. Each incident is treated individually.
- The officer was good but could be abrupt at times.
- The officer communicated well but could have been perceived as being prejudice because of the immediate suspicion.
- **CN:** The volume of questions was good, the answers given were building the evidence. It was also good that the officers checked the car in case a hammer had been put in there before the officers arrived.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 14 (100%)	Amber:	Red:
----------------------------	-------------------------	---------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:	
	<i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i>	
Name:		Date:

Incident 3			
Review Date:	19/03/2026	BWV reference:	SS/2054003048/1
Incident Date:	03/01/2026	Incident time:	14:00

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: Officers have seen two males, with one seen to be smoking what is believed to be cannabis. The males are stopped, where one has then tried to flee. Comments: • Short and to the point • There were two males referenced in the grounds, was it the one who was smoking who ran away? The grounds could be a little clearer to differentiate the two males. CB: That information is not documented anywhere. • The grounds are clear enough. • Sufficient grounds. • The phrase 'made off' isn't necessarily clear to people whose first language is not English. CN: This is common use in police language but can understand that this may not be recognised widely.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 14 (100%)	Amber:	Red:

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

- Why was there so much walking? There seemed a lack of control by the officer.
- They seemed to be walking to a location where the road was wider as the path was narrow where the stop had happened.
- The officer may have been heading in the direction of the other officer who had chased the second person, although they weren't walking very fast.
- The officer had a friendly manner.
- The officer did not ask the subject if they had anything on them that they shouldn't have.
- No gloves were worn by the officer.
- The officer did not explain the information properly.
- Does the officer need to ask if they can take the hoodie or coat off.
- **CN:** The officer has not got control of the search. It is not advisable to carry out a search when alone as it is not effective.
- The search was not very thorough, and the hood was not searched.
- The officer put themselves at risk by not controlling the subject which could have allowed them to remove items from their pockets.
- The officer did not say how long the copy of the search was available for.
- The officer should have cuffed the subject as they were alone.
- The search was a bad search, but the officer didn't do anything wrong so it is difficult to vote.
- The officer made themselves vulnerable.
- Engaging with the detained subject may have stopped them from running.
- Where the officer led the subject to was wider with less cars.
- Can this be fed back as a learning opportunity and reflective practice? **CB:** It will be fed back to their line manager who will decide the appropriate follow-up.

Overall RAG rating:	Green:	Amber: 13 (93%)	Red: 1 red (7%)
----------------------------	---------------	------------------------	------------------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:	
<i>Eg – feedback to officer as the most basic</i>	<i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i>	
Name:		Date:

Incident 4			
Review Date:	19/03/2026	BWV reference:	SS/2426828035/7
Incident Date:	15/01/2026	Incident time:	14:55

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: Officers on patrol have spotted a car which is missing its rear number plate, after following the car for a period of time, the car makes evasive action to avoid officers. The car is stopped and a search is carried out. Comments: - The subject is detained for not wanting to be stopped rather than misuse of drugs therefore these grounds are not accurate. - The subject is driving with no rear number plate. - The grounds should not be built on Section 23 as there is nothing to suspect drugs at that point. - There are grounds to stop based on the number plate, but not section 23. - The officer had good local knowledge.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 2 (14%)	Amber: 9 (65%)	Red: 3 (21%)

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
The detainee talked too much, trying to distract from the matter in hand.

- The ethnicity of the subject may have contributed to the stop which could be a concern.
- Can we drive without a number plate? **CN**: It would be a ticket which the other officer did in the back of the car.
- Was there a reason why there was no number plate? Were they trying to avoid being caught.
- The officer was slightly on the aggressive side during the initial interaction which didn't help.
- The officer was intent on finding drugs
- The suspicion might just be because of the car type.
- It should have been a vehicle stop.
- The search was performed ok even though the grounds were not there.
- There were grounds for a vehicle stop, but not grounds for a stop and search.
- If a person is stopped for a traffic offence, can they automatically be searched as well.
CB: Grounds have to be formed for stop and search, it would not be based on a traffic offence.
- The process of the search was green, it was the grounds that were the issue.
- **CN**: The officers did not ask many questions or make conversation with the subject.
Traffic stops can often lead to much more than the offence stopped for.
- The subject was given a ticket by the other officer for not having a number plate.

Overall RAG rating:	Green:	Amber: 12 (86%)	Red: 2 (14%)
----------------------------	---------------	------------------------	---------------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:
	<i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i>
Name:	Date:

Incident 5			
Review Date:	19/03/2026	BWV reference:	SS/2656897238/3
Incident Date:	24/01/2026	Incident time:	13:45

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: Officers called to a disused building with reports there are individuals inside, potentially stealing copper cable.			
Comments: • Maybe slightly too long but content is fine. • Comprehensive grounds. • Informative grounds.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 14 (100%)	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
• Did the officer check the subject on the Police National Computer? • It wasn't clear when the officer was talking what they were searching the subject for. • CB: After the interaction on BWV, the officers walk the subject outside and have a further conversation with them. • The detaining officer seemed slightly hesitant. • The reference number says third search however it seemed like it was their first one. • The officer asked if the subject consented to being searched by them as the officer was female and subject male. • CB: Female student officers do not get the opportunity to search as much as male officers and therefore they may take this opportunity to perform the search. • CN: No complaints have been made by males that have been searched by females. • The male officer is quite aggressive initially. • The officers may have been startled by the presence of someone in the building. • The subject could have jumped out and tried to attack.

- Did the female officer go through GOWISELY entirely? **CB:** Yes, but not in that exact order.
- The subject should have been handcuffed as they were looking for a weapon. **CN:** The officer may have said weapon but meant tool as there were reports of a break-in.
- It is the professional judgement of an officer whether to handcuff.
- The officer was asking questions but then the experienced officer interrupted and therefore the officer never followed up with what they were going to say.
- As there was a language barrier, are translation tools available? **CN:** There is a translation tool that should be used but sometimes officers use Google translate.
- It is wrong to use google translate as it is not accurate.
- Once arrested, the translation tool must be used.
- Amber rating because the subject might have had a weapon but they were not handcuffed.
- **CN:** There are no exceptions for a search not to be done. If a female officer isn't available for a female search, a male officer is permitted to carry this out and vice versa.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 12 (86%)	Amber: 2 (14%)	Red:
----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
<i>Eg – feedback to officer as the most basic</i>	<i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i>
Name:	Date: