Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel

Stop and Search Capture Document

Panel date:	28/07/2026
Number of panel members in attendance:	15 members including the vice chair
Constabulary attendees:	*Caitlin Bones, Inclusion & Legitimacy Co-ordinator (CB), Inspector Colin Norden (CN)*
OPCC attendees:	*Charlie Murfitt Governance and Compliance Officer (CM), Matilda Pearson Senior Policy Officer (MP)*

Agenda item 1 - Minutes and Actions from Previous Meeting	The minutes were signed off as a true and accurate record from the meeting held 23/04/2026.
	• Three actions arose from the previous meeting.
	  ○ Two actions related to officer feedback.
	  ○ One action related to reminding an officer to activate BWV on arrival.
	• All actions have been completed and feedback provided.

Agenda item 2 – Stop Search Theme & Data	• The intended theme was stop searches in knife crime hotspots however due to an ICT outage, historical stop search records linked to hotspot locations could not be accessed. Following consultation with the OPCC, the panel reviewed stop searches involving offensive weapons instead. • During a 25-day period, 118 stop searches were recorded. • Sixteen of those searches related to offensive weapons. • Officers continued recording stop searches using contingency recording methods including MS Forms and pocket notebooks.
Agenda item 3 – BWV Review	Reviews can be found further down in the document.
Agenda Item 4 – AOB & Dates of next meeting	Date of next meeting – Tuesday 11th August – Vehicle Stops Thursday 27th August – Custody Tuesday 29th September – UoF Thursday 29th October - Stop and Search

Incident 1			
Review Date:	28/07/2026	BWV reference:	56
Incident Date:	11/07/2026	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: Male reported to be making inappropriate comments to females and when challenged, the male has stated they had a knife. The male was located and detained for a Section 1 PACE search. **Comments:** • The grounds were considered straightforward. • The panel were satisfied sufficient grounds existed to conduct the stop search.			
Grounds RAG rating:	**Green:** 13	**Amber:**	**Red:**

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- The language was totally unnecessary.
- The officer's behaviour made me uncomfortable.
- The officer's behaviour was excessive.
- Should the officer have called for assistance first given the size of the male?
- Was the male confirmed as being the person who made the threat in the pub? **CB:** At the time he was believed to be the male and this was confirmed following the stop search.
- Was there someone from the pub who identified him?
- The officer appeared to lose his temper.
- The officer returned to using bad language after he had time to calm down.
- The F word was heard approximately ten times.
- It would be interesting to know whether this is normal for the officer or whether there were other factors that evening.
- It is understandable why the officer was cautious given the report of a knife.
- The aggressive nature of the officer's communication seemed excessive.
- Are officers taught whether they can use the F word? **CB:** Officers are taught to be

respectful and mindful that they represent the police service. Swearing is not specifically prohibited but should only be used when required.

- Was the officer based at Cambourne because of staffing issues? **CB:** No. The officer was part of the Neighbourhood Support Team covering the South of the county.
- There was a noticeable difference between the original officer and the officers who arrived afterwards.
- The other officers appeared much calmer.
- The original officer seemed less professional.
- The officer searching the bag was not wearing gloves.
- If the officer felt unsafe, why approach alone?
- Going in with all guns blazing felt unprofessional.
- The officer's language could have aggravated the situation rather than calmed it.
- The subject appeared too drunk to notice much of what was being said.
- We have reviewed encounters involving more violent detainees and not heard this level of swearing before.
- The level of swearing did not feel appropriate.
- There were 5 officers later, but only one officer initially.
- The officer was afraid for his life hence his behaviour. Other than that, he has to be educated on unconscious bias and more.
- There appeared to be no imperative for him to act without support. He was not confident or competent to initiate handcuffing action
- It was shocking
- There was a report of an armed suspect on the street. If the officer had delayed and in the interim a member of the public was attacked, this would be a very different conversation

Overall RAG rating:	**Green:** 2	**Amber:** 3	**Red:** 9

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:
The majority of panel members were clearly uneasy about the use of language from the outset of the officer and that is reflected in the comments above. As per process, as this case is majority red, this will be escalated to PSD for review.

Actions arising:	**Feedback:**

• **Refer encounter to PSD in line with panel terms of reference.** • **Feedback regarding language and professionalism to be provided to the officer.**	*Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23*
Name:	**Date:**

Incident 2			
Review Date:	28/07/2026	BWV reference:	58
Incident Date:	12/07/2026	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: A 12-year-old male was reported by carers as being in possession of a flick knife and heading to a location to fight another individual. The male ran from officers and later stated he had discarded the knife. **Comments:** • The grounds clear and straightforward. • The grounds were satisfactory. • The panel agreed officers were entitled to doubt the claim that the knife had been discarded. • I would have been worried he still had it or he would not have headed to area for the fight.			
Grounds RAG rating:	**Green:** 15	**Amber:** 1	**Red:** 0

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
• The Sergeant dealt with the child very well. • The Sergeant was professional throughout. • GOWISELY was explained clearly.

- The interaction was handled sensitively.
- There was a significant contrast compared with the previous encounter.
- The child appeared familiar with police processes.
- The officers dealt appropriately with someone who appeared to be in regular police contact.
- The officer asked about issues with carers.
- From a safeguarding perspective, the officer could have explored the issue further.
- Would officers make a safeguarding referral in these circumstances? **CB:** Safeguarding concerns can be referred through the MASH (Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub) and partner agencies where appropriate.
- The interaction between the Sergeant and the child was excellent.
- The officer remained calm throughout.
- The officer explained everything carefully.
- The officer ensured there was no confusion about what was happening.
- Could it have been the male in the navy t-shirt that swore rather than the officers. **CB**: That was another older child at the park who swore, not the officers.
- Excellent interaction with the youngster.
- On two occasions, the child said he had chucked the knife when he heard sirens, quite some distance from where he was seen.
- Is there a minimum age you would consider it safe to taser, and is there anything around that in taser training? **CN**: There is no minimum age or any law, the officer would have to justify any use, they do get extra training each year which is just around Taser.
- Who shouted taser? **CB**: It was the female officer as she was carrying the taser and it would be the taser trained/carrying officer who would shout the warning.
- Well dealt with. The detainee was also compliant.
- Firm when needed but well done.

Overall RAG rating:	**Green:** 16	**Amber:**	**Red:**

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
There were no concerns raised in this case.	
Actions arising:	**Feedback:**

• **Positive feedback to be provided to the officers involved.**	*Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23*
Name:	**Date:**

Incident 3			
Review Date:	28/07/2026	BWV reference:	18
Incident Date:	03/07/2026	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 were directed by CCTV to a male suspected of concealing a knife. Written grounds stated a white male had been involved; however the CCTV description and subject reviewed were Black. **Comments:** • It is difficult to see why this person was detained. • There was no clear explanation as to why he had been singled out. • There was no mention of a knife until the male denied having one. • Could the knife have been seen on CCTV? • The grounds should be sufficient for someone to understand why they were searched. • The officer later explained that CCTV had reported the male placing an item believed to be a knife down his trousers. • Why was he detained? **CB**: Detained is what occurs when you are stop searched, you are detained for the period of the search. • Presuming the male fitted the description, that should be in the officer's report as to why he stopped him. • The officer also needs to mention that a knife was seen on CCTV to show grounds. • The text in the grounds was inadequate.			
Grounds RAG rating:	**Green:** 4	**Amber:** 6	**Red:** 3

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:			
• The grounds say officer self-initiated however it was the CCTV operator where the intelligence came from. **CB**: The officers get four choices on their grounds form, which is intelligence led, incident related, officer self-initiated or member of the public led. Therefore, it falls probably somewhere between officer self-initiated based on the report received combined with the intelligence provided to the officer. • There was an impression that the subject felt he was being targeted because of his race. • The officer explained clearly why the search was taking place. • The officer handled the encounter professionally. • The paperwork recorded a White male but the CCTV description was IC3. • The paperwork was sloppy. • It was unfortunate that the incorrect ethnicity had been recorded. • It would have helped if the written grounds had contained the CCTV information. • The stop search itself was handled well. • The officers showed patience throughout. • The subject was calm until handcuffs were applied. • The officers had a large audience watching them and handled this well. • The stop itself appeared professional even though the paperwork contained errors. • Is it possible to correct the paperwork once submitted? **CB:** On the usual system, yes, mistakes can be corrected after submitting. On this occasion, as a Microsoft form was used, mistakes cannot be rectified. However, administrative checks would be completed before Home Office submission, where the data will be reviewed and corrected before transfer onto the main system. • In the grounds what does directed by 1090 CCTV mean? **CN**: 1090 is CCTV control room - they see an incident and direct officer to it or people walking away • The officers did a good job with the information given			
Overall RAG rating:	**Green:** 12	**Amber:** 0	**Red:** 1

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
The concerns with this case were mainly around the errors/discrepancies with the Grounds rather than the way in which the S&S was handled.	
Actions arising:	**Feedback:**

• **Feedback to officer regarding accuracy and detail of grounds recording.**	*Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23*
Name:	**Date:**

Incident 4			
Review Date:	28/07/2026	BWV reference:	60
Incident Date:	11/07/2026	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: Following a machete attack in Cambridge, officers engaged with a male near the incident location. The officer described the male as acting evasively, fidgeting and placing his hands in and out of his pockets. **Comments:** • The wording regarding the male smiling is not appropriate. • How could the officer know that the male was smiling because he knew he was about to be engaged? • Hopefully the behaviour described in the grounds is reflected in the BWV. • There was sufficient information to justify a search. • Only IC3 youth was written as the description therefore it is possible there needs to be more to justify a search. • The quality of the written report is concerning.			
Grounds RAG rating:	**Green:** 10	**Amber:** 4	**Red:** 0

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
• The officer showed patience throughout. • The subject continually talked over the officer. • The officer managed an irritating situation well.

- The officer remained calm despite repeated interruptions.
- The detainee was extremely verbose.
- The officers demonstrated patience throughout.
- People from some backgrounds may naturally smile and this should not necessarily be viewed as suspicious.
- Reference to smiling within the grounds could be interpreted as subjective.
- The officer explained the rationale clearly.
- The officer attempted repeatedly to have a conversation before detaining the subject.
- The subject repeatedly challenged the officer's rationale.
- The interaction remained professional throughout.
- It was concerning that it was reported as an incident with a machete where kids are playing.
- Does the person giving the information actually need to do the search, as he is giving his info but two others are doing the search **CN**: No, the same officer does not need to search but the officer doing the search should be recorded on the log. When possible it should be the same. In this case it could have been a female officer who stops and detains the subject, gives GOWISELY but then waits for a male officer to search for example.
- The female officer did some of the search, but the male searched the joggers.
- On the grounds, the officer should have stated that the other officers did the search, maybe a word to the officer to remind them to do that in the future.
- There is a real distrust between the black community and the police. It is not clear how the Constabulary are repairing this but moments like this could go so much smoother if there was not such a distrust in the community. The officer has honestly tried and should be commended for his efforts. He tried to build rapport and watching the interaction at the end it seems it ended pleasantly. However, it is that initial phase of bridging the gap between the community and police. Credit to this officer. He stayed calm and he really tried to engage. It was difficult considering the person named said they were drunk.
- The officer did well, he raised his voice to take control but was never out of order, the detainee left joking.
- Top marks for the officer for patience.
- In the face of a very verbal detainee, the officers were very patient.
- Provide feedback to that officer. His patience and his manner were very good throughout that interaction and the result of the detainee smiling at the end was

through his behaviour.			
Overall RAG rating:	**Green:** 12	**Amber:** 0	**Red:** 0

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
Again, the panel had some queries over the grounds but the actual interaction with the subject was viewed to be good by all.	
Actions arising:	**Feedback:**
• **Feedback regarding wording of grounds and objective recording of behaviour.**	*Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23*
Name:	**Date:**

Incident 5			
Review Date:	28/07/2026	BWV reference:	27
Incident Date:	04/07/2026	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 attended reports that a male had assaulted a shop owner with a hockey stick and stolen a phone. The suspect was linked to a specific vehicle which officers located nearby. **Comments:** • Hard to fault the grounds. • The grounds were very clear. • The grounds were straightforward. • A thorough report			
Grounds RAG rating:	**Green:** 14	**Amber:** 0	**Red:** 0

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:			
• The officer was calm and professional. • The officer developed good rapport with the subject. • The subject was cooperative. • The officer allowed the subject to explain his side of events. • Did the officer search the vehicle thoroughly enough? • Some cars have false floors within the boot area. • Could a hockey stick have been concealed under the boot floor? • Are officers able to search glove boxes if looking for a hockey stick? **CN:** No. Officers may only search places capable of concealing the item being sought. • There was a wheelie bin next to the vehicle which could potentially have been checked. • The officer maintained a friendly conversation throughout. • The encounter appeared well handled. • As the officer is searching the car rather than the subject, does she follow GOWISELY in same way? **CB**: Yes she gives GOWISELY to him as the vehicle keeper / owner. • The subject said the boot did not unlock and therefore had to go through the back of the car to get in the boot. • The officer was very patient			
Overall RAG rating:	**Green:** 13	**Amber:** 1	**Red:** 0

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
There weren't any concerns raised with how this interaction took place in terms of engagement with the subject, more the thoroughness of the search of the car. OPCC thoughts are that this feedback should be shared with all officers involved.	
Actions arising:	**Feedback:**
• **None**	
Name:	**Date:**

Incident 6			
Review Date:	28/07/2026	BWV reference:	16
Incident Date:	27/06/2026	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: Black males armed with knives, large zombie knife. Group have made off when seeing officers. Group was caught and male matching the description was detained. **Comments:** • Very detailed • The report writing could be clearer. • The grounds appear to contain a mixture of freehand narrative and template wording. • There appears to be copying and pasting from a template. • It is a stretch to say the subject matched the description perfectly. • A black male wearing black clothing amongst a group of black males could fit a broad description. • There is no mention of a backpack in the description of the detained male despite it being in the original suspect description. • The suspects were described as black males but later described as black teenagers. • There appears to be some ambiguity between the descriptions. • Is there a policy on the use of AI to write grounds? **CB:** AI cannot be used for evidential material and therefore cannot currently be used for writing stop and search grounds.			
Grounds RAG rating:	**Green:** 5	**Amber:** 8	**Red:** 0

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
• The officers approached shouting “hands, hands, hands” and “taser” which may have been confusing for the subject, the approach was appalling. • Although there were concerns around officer safety due to the report of knives, the

approach appeared more likely to escalate than de-escalate the situation.

- Several officers were shouting at the same time.
- There should be one officer taking charge of the communication.
- Having multiple officers shouting instructions at once is likely to raise anybody's blood pressure.
- The officers may benefit from additional training around who takes responsibility for communication within a group.
- Shouting calm down in a panicked way was not helpful.
- The officer with minimal voice should not have been the one to inform the suspect of his rights.
- The initial need for shock to achieve control could be understood, but it did sound like a gang up, although officer did try to be polite and fair, and followed GOWISELY.
- The subject's manner could be due to the fact he knew he had cannabis.
- Most people being stopped and searched are likely to feel aggrieved regardless of whether the stop is lawful.
- The officers appeared surprised by the subject's reaction when it should be expected.
- The original description was very specific but appeared to become watered down as the encounter progressed.
- The distinctive top mentioned in the original description did not appear to feature later.
- The male did not appear to genuinely match the original description.
- It felt as though he may simply have been in the wrong place at the wrong time.
- Human observations are often unreliable and descriptions given by witnesses may not always be accurate.
- Can officers continue searching if they cannot find a knife but then find drugs? **CN**: On this occasion, the drugs were found before the subject's legs had been searched so they were continuing on the original grounds.
- Although there are concerns of a knife, the manner of approach was very concerning. The start of that interaction could have been conducted in a far better way. This had no other way of going but the detainee getting angry at the disrespectful manner he was spoken in. When considering bridging relationships with the community, the manner the police approach certain scenarios with does not help at all. The grounds were also confusing as to what he was actually stopped for.
- This evening there appears to have been a surprisingly high number of black people reviewed during stop and search scrutiny.
- Cambridgeshire has a predominantly white population and this was noted by panel

members.

- It would be useful to review the disproportionality data.
- Could stop and search ethnicity data be shared with panel members? **CB:** This can be looked into and anonymised information could potentially be shared.
- The panel used to receive more stop and search data and statistics.
- It may be useful to circulate statistics by email ahead of meetings.
- Data could be provided either by email or within future meetings depending on panel interest.

Overall RAG rating:	**Green:** 3	**Amber:** 9	**Red:** 1

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:
It felt as though a number of panel members were uncomfortable with the approach that was taken by the officers from the outset, which could be reflected in the majority amber rating. There appears to be an appetite for reviewing data that currently is only reviewed by the Chairs of the panel. This is something that the OPCC can pick up with panel members and the Chair to understand if a data sub group is of interest, or if a summary input is needed at the start of each meeting. This will be discussed and an update provided at the next meeting.

Actions arising:	**Feedback:**
• **Provide additional stop and search ethnicity and disproportionality data to the panel for future review.** • **Feedback to officer regarding clarity and structure of written grounds.**	*Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23*

Name:	**Date:**