

Stop and Search Capture Document

Panel date:	26/06/2025
Number of panel members in attendance:	9 panel members including the chair and vice chair
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Steve Kerridge (SK), Caitlin Bones (CB)</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Heather Sheldon (HS), Charlie Murfitt (CM)</i>
Agenda item 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The minutes from the previous meeting in March were signed off as true and accurate.</li> <li>• Actions from the previous meeting were shared with the Officer’s Inspector and feedback will be circulated to the panel in due course. These actions were:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clear use of GOWISELY</li> <li>○ Explanation of Community Remedy to detainees</li> <li>○ Ensure all information is included in the search grounds</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Agenda item 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CB provided information on Stop Search Data for May 2025.</li> <li>• There were 231 stop and searches with eight carried out in the geographical area being scrutinised at this meeting.</li> <li>• Out of the eight searches, one did not have an age recorded, as it was solely a vehicle that was searched, not the driver.</li> <li>• All searches were on males and all officer defined ethnicity was recorded as White.</li> </ul>
Agenda item 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The theme for this evening’s meeting is focussing on the Wisbech area due to a perceived lack of trust and confidence in the area. KP gave an overview of recent incidents involving Fenland Officers which may have contributed to a lack of trust in confidence among local residents.</li> </ul>
AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPCC Volunteer Event – Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> July at Cambs HQ.</li> <li>• Stop Search training day at Monks Wood – TBC</li> <li>• <b>SK:</b> There has been an impact from the behaviour of the officers mentioned at the beginning of this meeting. Out of</li> </ul>

	<p>100's of interactions, the majority are very professional, however, the Constabulary do address instances when this falls below standards. It is hoped tonight has helped with perception and the Constabulary welcomes people to speak up with concerns they may have. SK thanked panel members for this evening's scrutiny.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KP commented that not all officers receive positive feedback therefore it was encouraging to be able to give feedback following tonight's scrutiny.</li> <li>• KP has spoken to the Communities Policy Officer at the OPCC with a proposal for the Commissioner to visit Wisbech.</li> </ul>
Date of next meeting	<p><b>Vehicle Stops</b> on Teams on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> July</p> <p><b>Custody</b> at Cambs HQ on Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> July – Apologies received and added to the OPCC attendance spreadsheet.</p>

Incident 1			
Review Date:	26/06/2025	BWV reference:	<b>SS/4096473021/1</b>
Incident Date:	13/05/2025	Incident time:	16:00

<p><b>Grounds: Written Assessment</b></p>
<p>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?</p>
<p><b>Overview: Officers have stopped and questioned a female on suspicion of stealing meat. Female's partner is also questioned and the vehicle searched for meat.</b></p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very comprehensive.</li> <li>• Perhaps some guidance on preparing grounds might be of use.</li> <li>• <b>CB</b> asked the panel, do they make sense? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "Meat behind seats" is repeated multiple times.</li> <li>○ There could have been some copying/pasting as the officer may have felt that they needed to complete all sections in the grounds template.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- **CB:** A template has been used hence the repetition of certain pieces of information. The template is there as a guide and officers usually remove the unnecessary wording.

<b>Grounds RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green:</b> 100%	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>
----------------------------	--------------------	---------------	-------------

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

- One panel member commented that the officer did not identify themselves – other panel members heard the name given, it was concluded overall GOWISELY was provided.
- The view of the BWV was good and the whole of the search was visible.
- Do checks get done on the PNC for stops like this?
  - **SK:** The checks would be done when the vehicle was first sighted. If it isn't, it would be done during the interaction. This would be to look at insurance, MOT and whether any markers were on the vehicle or person.
- The load on the back of the van looked unstable.
- Although they are looking for stolen meat, is it required to check for vehicle issues?
  - **SK:** Yes, they check the vehicle as standard. Officers will also check the person owning the vehicle as well.
- The camera was well positioned.
- **CB:** What are the thoughts on the rings the officer was wearing?
  - Simple band ring shouldn't be a problem.
  - Not chunky jewellery.
  - **SK:** In relation to rings, the policy is effectively a single band. A small additional ring that does not present risk to anyone (or risk splitting gloves) is generally accepted. However, a brace of rings across the fingers, or large stones is not acceptable.

<b>Overall RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green:</b> 100%	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>
----------------------------	--------------------	---------------	-------------

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

<b>Actions arising:</b>	<b>Feedback:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reminder of jewellery permitted as per the policy</li> </ul>	<i>Awaiting Update at the Next Meeting from the Constabulary</i>
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

Incident 2			
Review Date:	26/06/2025	BWV reference:	<b>SS/2628743773/25</b>
Incident Date:	18/05/2026	Incident time:	13:07

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?			
<p><b>Overview: Subjects have been seen exchanging items. Officers have walked past one of the subjects who appeared nervous of the police presence. Officers have approached and spoken to the subject who cannot account for their reasons for being in the area, an area which is also known for drugs.</b></p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grounds were good.</li> <li>Strong grounds based on them being self-built rather than incident related.</li> <li>Use of grammar is not ideal.</li> <li>Clear and to the point</li> </ul>			
<b>Grounds RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green:</b> 100%	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was it an officer on probation conducting the search as they introduced themselves verbally but also showed their warrant card which isn't necessary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>CB:</b> Unsure at this stage but it may indicate they are a newer officer.</li> </ul> </li> <li>It wasn't a detailed search, and it was difficult to see the search below the waist.</li> </ul>

- No JOG (jacket, outer clothes, gloves) was removed as they could have, making it harder to search.
  - **SK:** It would have been expected to ask the subject to remove their jacket. However, if the subject was arrested, the officers would do a thorough search before being placed in a van to ensure the detainee could not harm themselves during transit. In addition, the detainee would have a further thorough inspection when arriving at custody.
- Is it ok for females to search males.
  - **SK:** Yes, allowable under law and policy. Good practice would have been to ask if the detainee agreed to being searched by the opposite sex. Although not all of the search was visible on the BWV, it looked reasonably thorough.
- **HS:** What are the panel's thoughts on the level of understanding bearing in mind the language barrier? Should the officers have used an interpreter during the interaction?
  - The geographical area where the interaction took place has a high rate of foreign people. However, the detainee seemed to understand.
  - We cannot assume people are lying when they say they don't understand.
  - The officers should not assume the detainee understood, nor did they ask whether the detainee was willing to be searched by an officer of the opposite sex.
- When the officer asked the detainee about employment, the officer didn't respond very politely.
- This area is known for drug dealing.
- The whole interaction didn't feel right from start to finish.
- The angle of the footage was not very clear.
- It was difficult to see what type of spray was removed.
- The detainee stated that the spray was pepper spray, for the face.
- It was difficult to see the officer's hands during the search.
- Should the detainee not have been arrested for possession of the pepper spray?
  - **SK:** It would have been an option that the officers considered. The officers seized the spray and the knife. The detainee would have been reported for a summons, where the detainee will have to attend court and explain possession of them.

<b>Overall RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green:</b> 33%	<b>Amber:</b> 67%	<b>Red:</b>
----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------

<b>Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:</b>	
<b>Actions arising:</b>	<b>Feedback:</b>
<i>None</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

<b>Incident 3</b>			
Review Date:	26/06/2025	BWV reference:	<b>SS/2813900929/1</b>
Incident Date:	26/05/2025	Incident time:	15:00

<b>Grounds: Written Assessment</b>			
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?			
<b>Overview: Information received regarding two males attempting to break into buildings who then fled when officers arrived. One subject caught and searched.</b>			
<b>Comments:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good comprehensive grounds</li> <li>• Could 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> parties be referred to by a different letter of the alphabet when being referred to in the grounds as it is difficult to differentiate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>CB:</b> Yes, where there are multiple parties, they will be references as 1, 2, etc. but in this case all the references refer to the one individual, his name was just used a lot.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
<b>Grounds RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green: 100%</b>	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>

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

- Good introduction considering the officer was out of breath.
- The detainee may have been stopped frequently as they knew how many clicks of the cuff were needed to make wearing them more comfortable.
- Why was it not the female officer’s BWV?
  - **CB:** The angle from the other officer’s camera gave a clearer view of the interaction.
- If there had been an accusation by the detained person, it couldn’t be verified by any of the BWV available.
  - **SK:** BWV isn’t always available and before BWV was introduced, there were other ways in which this would have to be proved/disproved.
- **CB:** Going forward, which BWV would the panel like to see, the person searching or another officer with a better view?
  - There were a mix of responses from panel members with some preferring the footage from the searching officer however the majority preferred to have the best footage available rather than only the footage from the officer conducting the search.
- For a trainee, this was a commendable interaction and search - thorough, professional and considerate of the detainee's rights.
- Good audio description.
- The officer did very well, especially as a probationer.
- Can the panel have their feedback passed on to the officer on their excellent handling.
- The officer did very well.
- Polite and thorough. Needs more practice but that will come.

<b>Overall RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green:</b> 100%	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>
----------------------------	--------------------	---------------	-------------

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

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Commendable behaviour for probationary officer</b></li> </ul>	<i>Awaiting Update at the Next Meeting from the Constabulary</i>
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

<b>Incident 4</b>			
Review Date:	26/06/2025	BWV reference:	<b>SS/0013295121/30</b>
Incident Date:	28/05/2025	Incident time:	17:15

<b>Grounds: Written Assessment</b>			
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?			
<p><b>Overview: Two people have been seen in an area of the town which has been issued a closure ordered, appearing to exchange items. As officers have arrived at the location, the van and bike have left, however the van is located a few minutes later and stopped.</b></p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good comprehensive grounds</li> <li>• No issues</li> </ul>			
<b>Grounds RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green: 100%</b>	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>

<b>Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The detainee was cuffed in front, not behind. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>CB:</b> It is down to officer discretion as to whether to cuff at the front or back. It would have been easier to cuff at the front whilst the male was exiting the vehicle. Compliant searches may be cuffed at the front.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Did they tell the detainee they were entitled to a copy of the search? <b>This could not be verified.</b></li> </ul>

- This was the searching officer's camera.
- Why wasn't the van searched?
  - **SK:** The cannabis was found on the person. The incident could have justified a wider search however it is likely that it was the person on the mountain bike who was the seller.
- The person in the passenger seat was asked to call someone.
  - **SK:** Detainees shouldn't be allowed to make calls during a search or interaction but it is more difficult with modern technology to prevent this and if they ask others to ring, it is harder to prevent unless there are more officers to assist.
- This person has been searched and nothing has happened.
  - **SK:** Although they were not arrested, the officers can give an alternative outcome, such as community resolution. Possession is an offence so this will be considered.
  - **SK:** If a detainee is given a summons, this means the officers will go away to build a file which is then passed to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and then a notice is issued to attend court.
- Why wasn't the passenger searched?
  - **CB:** The incident which led to the stop search was between a person on a bike and the driver of the van. Officers have to have suspicion for each person they search which is individual and specific to that person.

<b>Overall RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green:</b> 89%	<b>Amber:</b> 11%	<b>Red:</b>
----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------

<b>Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:</b>	
<b>Actions arising:</b>	<b>Feedback:</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Feedback on remembering to offer the entitlement to a copy of the search.</b></li> </ul>	<i>Awaiting Update at the Next Meeting from the Constabulary</i>
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

<b>Incident 5</b>			
Review Date:	26/06/2025	BWV reference:	<b>SS/4275150546/39</b>
Incident Date:	29/05/2025	Incident time:	13:44

<b>Grounds: Written Assessment</b>			
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?			
<p><b>Overview: Two Males in March have been seen in an area known for drug use, as well as being known as drug users themselves. On approaching, the males have attempted to disperse quick, however officers have caught up with one of the males and detained them for a search.</b></p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good grounds</li> </ul>			
<b>Grounds RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green: 100%</b>	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>

<b>Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did they know if the detainee was disabled or not when they asked them to stand up? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>CB:</b> Yes, the detainee is known to officers and are aware that the scooter was given to them as a gift by an elderly couple and used as transport only not due to a disability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The 2<sup>nd</sup> officer is searching the scooter.</li> <li>• Is it classed as a search of the vehicle? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>CB:</b> Mobility scooters are not classed as motor vehicles so we would not</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

expect a vehicle record, we would treat it as a personal item, aid etc.

- Do scooters need insurance?
  - **CB:** Insurance is not required for mobility scooters
- There was a length of time that the camera was pointing at the ground/the officer's boots.
  - **CB:** This is because the officer was searching the detainee's socks and shoes so was bent down.
- Can we give feedback regarding the camera angle.
- The officer made reference to a trailer that had been seen in the last few days but had since been removed.
- Uncertain about the appropriateness of the dropping of the joggers in the street.
  - **SK:** 'O' in JOG has been adapted in practice overtime to reflect changes in society of now wearing more than one pair of trousers, which make searching extremely difficult. So we treat 'O' now as standing for 'outer clothing' therefore as long as there is more clothing underneath, so shorts or trousers that are not underwear, then this is acceptable.

<b>Overall RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green:</b> 100%	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>
----------------------------	--------------------	---------------	-------------

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

<b>Actions arising:</b>	<b>Feedback:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Feedback to be given reminding officers to be aware of the angle of BWV</b></li> </ul>	<p><i>Awaiting Update at the Next Meeting from the Constabulary</i></p>

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

Incident 6			
Review Date:	26/06/2025	BWV reference:	<b>SS/1054926566/11</b>
Incident Date:	29/05/2025	Incident time:	15:18

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?			
<p><b>Overview:</b> A young male has been reported as being seen near a disused building, looking into windows. The subject has also been reported as wearing a balaclava and gloves despite the weather being hot.</p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great improvement in written grounds</li> </ul>			
<b>Grounds RAG rating:</b>	<b>Green:</b> 100%	<b>Amber:</b>	<b>Red:</b>

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should there be an Appropriate Adult (AA)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>CB:</b> Not for JOG searches - a standard stop search requires no AA at any age. It is only when it becomes a strip search or post-arrest custody strip search then an AA is needed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Why wasn't the detainee asked why they were wearing a balaclava on a hot day? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The question was asked but no answer was given.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Absolutely brilliant interaction</li> <li>• The detainee stated they were, "waiting for my friend" however the grounds state they said, "waiting for a mate". <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>CB:</b> Grounds are not a statement they do not have to be word exact to what was stated by detainees. The purpose of the grounds is to explain the overall reasoning why the officer did the stop search.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The officers dealt with the young person exceptionally well.</li> <li>• Five stars for interaction with minor</li> </ul>

