

Stop and Search Capture Document

Panel date:	23/04/2026
Number of panel members in attendance:	9
Constabulary attendees:	<i>Caitlin Bones, Colin Norden</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>Charlie Murfitt, Matilda Pearson</i>
Agenda item 1 - Minutes and Actions from Previous Meeting	The minutes were signed off as a true and accurate record from the meeting held 19/03/2026. There were no actions.
Agenda item 2 – Stop Search Theme & Data	• The meeting commenced with a short presentation and introduction to Live Facial Recognition in order to consult with members of the panel on their thoughts / concerns around it. • The theme for panel is 'Stop Searches with subject who has neurodiversity and/or mental health'. • Between 01/11/2025 and 31/03/2026 2 records referenced ADHD and 5 referenced mental health. • More stop searches may have involved this theme however this field of data is not ordinarily collected.
Agenda item 3 – BWV Reviews	BWV Review – see below
Agenda Item 4 – AOB & Dates of next meeting	Vehicle Stops - Tuesday 19th May 2026 In-Person at Cambs HQ Custody - Tuesday 26th May 2026 Online via TEAMS Use of Force - Thursday 25th June 2026 18:00-21:00hrs In-Person at Cambs HQ Stop and Search - Tuesday 28th July 2026 Online via TEAMS

Incident 1			
Review Date:	23/04/2026	BWV reference:	SS/0502563192/45
Incident Date:	13/02/2026	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: Officers called to reports of a male looking into cars and trying car doors. The male was agitated which the male attributed to ADHD. Comments: The panel were satisfied with the grounds.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 9 (100%)	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
- Very well done by the officer - The behaviour seemed to be bordering on mental health. - Is it illegal to look in cars? CN: If the person is then trying doors as well, then yes. - Is the CCTV footage admissible? CN: Yes, this is used regularly as evidence. - It is poor the police officer let the subject go. - Reports said the subject was trying to open car doors but perhaps the CCTV was unable to clarify this. - Taking into account the subject's neurodiversity, it may mean that they do not behave with the same rationale as others. - They couldn't prove there was no intent to commit theft. - The outcome could be wrong. - Voting should be based on the quality of the stop search, rather than the outcome. - GOWISELY was completed and in terms of the stop search scenario, it was good. - The officer kept calm which helped not escalate the situation. - Good rapport - The officer handled the situation well, the conversation was chaotic but the officer

engaged well with them. ▪ Honest, polite and nice officer. ▪ Good engagement. ▪ If the subject had been arrested, questions may have been asked for the rationale as the evidence did appear enough to justify arrest. ▪ The person had satisfied the officer that there were no offences.			
Overall RAG rating:	Green: 8 (89%)	Amber: 1 (11%)	Red:

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
This account is an accurate summary of the conversation took place. No additional comments have been provided by the Chair and no actions arose.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 12/05/2026

Incident 2			
Review Date:	23/04/2026	BWV reference:	SS/4022989903/52
Incident Date:	09/11/2025	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: Officers on patrol in Peterborough informed by CCTV operators that a male has a knife at the train station. The subject has stated they have ADHD. Comments: • Should the officers not ask the suspect if they have anything on them which included a

bladed object. • Surely the presence of a knife is enough. • A non-locking knife under 3 inches is not illegal.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:			
There was no BWV available for this stop search.			
Overall RAG rating:	Green:	Amber:	Red:

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
This is accurate for the conversation that took place and no additional comments are required. There was no BWV for this so the grounds were all that could be reviewed.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 12/05/2026

Incident 3			
Review Date:	23/04/2026	BWV reference:	SS/1485642213/18
Incident Date:	13/02/2026	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: Officers called to One Stop in Waterbeach where a male had declared they had a pistol and wanted support for their mental health.

Comments:

- The panel were satisfied with the grounds.

Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 9 (100%)	Amber:	Red:
----------------------------	------------------------	---------------	-------------

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- The two officers should be commended.
- What could be offered in custody to support mental health? **CN:** The subject can be referred to a mental health agency such as Liaison and Diversion Samaritans (LADS).
- If an ambulance had attended, what would have happened. **CN:** They could have taken the subject to hospital for appropriate treatment.
- Would the custody sergeant have sent the subject to hospital? **CN:** Not necessarily. LADS which can initiate a support needs assessment in custody. The test for a custody officer is risk associated with loss of life.
- The officers handled the situation really well. They were respectful and supportive throughout the whole process.
- The Armed Response Unit may have dealt with the situation differently so the officers (who were armed with tasers) did a calm job.
- Good communication and friendly.
- There was good teamwork between the officers. Whilst the search was being carried out, the other officer was engaging in conversation with the subject and being supportive.
- It was a well handled situation.
- The officers were reassuring and respectful.
- The officers performed excellently and should be commended.

Overall RAG rating:	Green: 9 (100%)	Amber:	Red:
----------------------------	------------------------	---------------	-------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

All panel members were complimentary of this encounter and considered it very well handled by the officers in attendance. No additional comments have been provided by the Chair.

Actions arising:		Feedback:	
Feedback praise to the officers		Officers provided with feedback	
Name: Matilda Pearson			Date: 12/05/2026

Incident 4			
Review Date:	23/04/2026	BWV reference:	SS/3719695267/1
Incident Date:	04/12/2025	Incident time:	01:00

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 called by CCTV operators to reports of a male throwing a bin at shop windows. Further reports suggested they also had a screwdriver. The suspect declared they were suffering from mental health. Comments: - Should the officers not ask the suspect if they have anything sharp on them before carrying out the search. - GOWISELY was given after the search.			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green:	Amber: 9 (100%)	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
- The stop search was carried out in the wrong order. - One panel member did not hear the police station or officer give their name, however other panel members did hear this being given. - The recording did not start until the second search started. - Both officers should have had BWV on when they got out of the car.

- Did the other officers write their own version of the grounds. CB: No, grounds are only written by the person searching. - The officer offered to ride in the back of the van with the subject, is this permitted? CN: The officer would have meant the seat in the back of the van which is on the other side of the cage the detainee is locked in. Officers sit in this seat to monitor the detainee on the way to custody. - This could have been better explained. - What does 1090 mean? CB: CCTV Operators - The detainee was calm enough walk into the van himself in the end. - It wasn't a smooth rapport and the officer had to repeat himself several times. - The subject was said to be handcuffed, but there was no detail as to when they were uncuffed. - The use of force is questionable. - There was no explanation about handcuffs but they have been removed at some point.			
Overall RAG rating:	Green:	Amber: 9 (100%)	Red:

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
The panel were confused at first regarding this encounter but on conclusion could work it out. Overall they were not satisfied with the way in which it was handled and the rating reflects this. No additional comments have been provided by the Chair.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
Officers to be reminded to switch on BWV on arrival.	Officers provided with feedback
Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 12/05/2026

Incident 5			
Review Date:	23/04/2026	BWV reference:	SS/0006849838/3
Incident Date:	07/02/2026	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: Officers called by member of the public stating a male had approached them stating someone was chasing them with a pistol. The subject declared they were suffering a mental health crisis. Comments: • Observant description • Everything was covered • The grounds would have taken a long time to write			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
• It was concerning that the subject could not stand properly but the officer allowed them to get up and start walking around. They could have injured themselves and were close to the road. • There were enough officers who could have intervened if necessary. • Officers appeared sympathetic. • The officers gave the subject plenty of time to talk. • The officer explained things multiple times so that the subject could understand. • The officer was patient and allowed the subject to babble but the officer also made sure the subject understood what they were saying. • The lack of search on person is confusing. • The officer gave the full information but did not complete a full search. • The officer did not explain the reason for no search. • The officer took the subject's word that they had no drugs on them. CN: It is the officer's discretion as to whether to complete a full search. • The subject engaged well and gave relevant information. • Bearing in mind the subject said they had a cat, do the police call the RSPCA about the animal being left? CN: Questions are asked on arrest as to whether they are a carer or have pets. • The officer had a nice rapport and handled the situation sensitively.

The officer was gentle, introduced herself well and informed the subject about the footage and explained everything well.			
Overall RAG rating:	Green: 100%	Amber:	Red:

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:			
The panel were very complimentary of the grounds and recognised the level of detail that had been included. No additional comments have been provided by the Chair.			
Actions arising:	Feedback:		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Name: Matilda Pearson</td> <td>Date: 12/05/2026</td> </tr> </table>		Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 12/05/2026
Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 12/05/2026		

Incident 6			
Review Date:	23/04/2026	BWV reference:	SS/2751584610/4
Incident Date:	16/12/2026	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: Officers called by Ambulance to reports of woman self-harming in toilets in supermarket. Mental Health nurse was with ambulance crew.
Comments: - Did they establish where her wounds were? - As the ambulance was there, she may have been treated. - If she was actively bleeding, there would have been some other treatment.

• The wounds didn't necessarily have to be on the wrists. • The report says attempting to self-harm. • Lucky coincidence that the MH nurse was part of the ambulance crew			
Grounds RAG rating:	Green: 9 (100%)	Amber:	Red:

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:			
• The situation was handled well, the subject clearly didn't want to be searched. They were sympathetic, when she was standing up. • The officers were exceptional. • The handcuffs seemed unnecessary. • The officers could have uncuffed the subject and taken their coat off. • The officers may have cuffed for their own safety. • The officers could have been fairly junior. • The subject was compliant and calm but highly distressed. • The suspect was not giving any response. • Can the justification for the use of force be feedback to the panel. CB: This information will be shared in due course. • The officers did well to carry out the search in such a small space, especially with someone who had potentially self-harmed. • The subject was handcuffed at the front, not the back. • The handcuffing could be a sign of incidents the officers have dealt with previously. • Their findings justified the use of cuffs as they couldn't have known what the subject was going to do. • The subject was not communicating therefore the officers didn't know their true character. • The subject displayed unpredictable behaviour. • The incident took place in a confined space where the officers could not easily back away. • The officers are protecting the subject as well as themselves. • They knew the ambulance crew had been there two hours and not been able to make progress. • The officers should be commended for the conduct.			
Overall RAG rating:	Green: 9 (100%)	Amber:	Red:

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
Although some members raised some concerns during the encounter, overall the feeling was that these two young officers had a very good manner with the individual and that it was a great and thorough search. No additional comments have been received from the Chair.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
• Feedback praise to officers involved.	• Officers provided with feedback
Name: Matilda Pearson	Date: 12/05/2026