Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel

Use of Force Minutes

Panel date:	25 June 2026
Number of panel members in attendance:	14
Constabulary attendees:	*Cailtin Bones, Inclusion & Legitimacy Co-ordinator (CB), DS Sean Feline (SF), Inspector Colin Norden (CN)*
OPCC attendees:	*Charmaine Christie, Review, Compliance & Governance Officer (CC), Matilda Pearson, Senior Policy Officer (MP)*
Agenda Item 1	**Officer Safety Training (OST)** A member of the OST team provided the Panel with information on officer safety training that takes place throughout BCH.
Agenda Item 2	**Previous Minutes and Actions** The panel agreed the minutes for the previous use of force scrutiny meeting.
Agenda Item 3	**Use of Force Data** The Panel were provided with use of force data recorded in May 2026. This included data relating to PAVA, the theme of today's scrutiny session. Of the 1157 use of force forms in May 2026, PAVA was used 36 times (88.9% effective) drawn 21 times (95.2% effective).
Date of next meeting	Stop and search – 28 July 2026

Incident 1			
Review Date:	25/06/2026	BWV reference:	**UF/2339426571/66**

Background Information:
The subject was initially arrested for threatening behaviour at the incident location and was not compliant, so force has been used to apply the handcuffs and transport to hospital. He has then attempted to apply a ligature (shoelaces and t-shirt) around his neck and blocked the van door from closing with his leg, pava has been used to get him

to retract his leg and aftercare provided.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:	
• Was it necessary to use PAVA when the subject was already inside a police vehicle? • Seemed like the use of PAVA was more for convenience rather than necessity, due to the length of time being taken. • Think the initial officer was dealing with the situation well, however the last officer escalated the situation. • Do not believe the use of PAVA was needed, they could have waited and de-escalated the situation. There was a lack of de-escalation. • Officers used PAVA rather than having to manhandle him, which is safer for everyone. • He was physically injured (arm in plaster) and therefore it was better that the officers used PAVA, than to physically handle him. • It was a difficult situation. Officers were patient. PAVA was used as a last resort.	
RAG rating:	Green: 12 Amber: 2

Chair's comments:	
Actions arising:	**Feedback:**
Name:	**Date:**

Incident 2			
Review Date:	26/06/2026	BWV reference:	**UF/1275831009/23**

Background Information:
The initial report is from the subject's older brother who reports that he has been threatening him with a plank of wood that has nails sticking out of it as well as using the weapon to cause damage.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:	
• There was quite a lot of silence. As a child, maybe the subject could have done with some more friendly chat. • He was never going to drop the stick without the use of PAVA. • Officers shouldn't have used the PAVA. He wasn't threatening them and they could have engaged with him more. • PAVA was used quite quickly. • Concerned he was handcuffed after the PAVA. Was this needed? • Arrest justified. Could have had more contact with the mother or brother. Officers could have been chattier with the subject. • Officers exercised patience, tried to de-escalate and spoke calmly to try and find a way to resolve. After care was provided after the PAVA to help him. Officers took their time. • The use of handcuffs seemed unnecessary after the weapon was removed. Could have more of an attempt to engage. • Officers spoke reasonably and calmy with the subject and remained patient. • Not convinced the PAA was necessary. Officers could have given the subject more time given his age.	
RAG rating:	Green: 11 Amber: 2 Abstained: 1

Chair's comments:

Actions arising:	**Feedback:**
Name:	**Date:**

Incident 3			
Review Date:	25/06/2026	BWV reference:	**UF/4160635913/66**

Background Information:
Officers were flagged down to an RTC and while assessing the damage the subject (who has been drink driving) got back in his car and attempted to make off, the officer removes him from the vehicle attempts to handcuff him and uses PAVA due to resistance from the subject.

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:	
• Unsure whether the member of the public who helped the officers during the handcuffing was beneficial or hindered the situation. • There was a lack of control on the officer's part. It felt like the subject had more control and required more force to be used. • This incident shows the importance of officers being double crewed. • It was a justifiable use of PAVA. • Subject wasn't complying. Circumstances looked like PAVA was needed. • Reasonable use of PAVA. More force may have been needed.	
RAG rating:	Green: 14

Chair's comments:

Actions arising:	**Feedback:**
Name:	**Date:**