

Panel date:	25/07/2024
Number of panel members in attendance:	10 panel members were in attendance, including the panel chair.
Constabulary attendees:	<i>6 representatives from the Constabulary attended, including 2 BWV auditors for the Constabulary.</i>
OPCC attendees:	<i>2 attendees from the OPCC attended.</i>
Agenda item 1	<p><u>Minutes from the previous meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes were shared with all panel members on email and no comments or amendments were raised. No additional comments were raised in the meeting. • The minutes of the previous meeting were approved. • Previous actions from the last meeting had been addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feedback to be provided to officer regarding a great example of a very professional Stop and Search - Congratulatory email sent to officer alongside feedback. ○ Vehicle Stop Data supplied to include the free-text details box in supplied data - Vehicle Stop Data will include details box going forward – we had to wait for IT to include it in the data able to be pulled which has now been done.
Agenda item 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on strip searches for the last month was presented. There were 3 (out of a total 236 stop searches) that took place. • Data was presented to panel members on frequent searchers. A discussion took place regarding the high number of stop searches in Huntingdon. The Constabulary explained that this was because of the co-ordination of the Neighbourhood Policing Team (NHPT) targeting areas with a high number of reports of drugs on this occasion. • A question was raised as to the outcome of stops which have resulted in a summons or voluntary attendance. The

	<p>Constabulary explained that this data was held on an alternative system as the data presented at panel meetings was purely around the stop search interaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was highlighted that for Officer D, out of 6 stops, only 2 objects were found. The Constabulary clarified that this was a Junior Officer on foot patrol who would have been out with a Senior Officer. • The amber and red grading of the grounds was queried. This is because a Senior Officer grades these and uses a high level of scrutiny when reviewing grounds, this is to promote continuous learning and improvement. • One panel member asked how many of the stop searches are random and how many are on specific intelligence. The Constabulary explained that in most cases, officers are patrolling areas / hotspots based on intelligence received.
<p>Agenda item 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the 8 cases selected by the chair, 11 videos relating to these were available.
<p>Minutes & AOB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chair welcomed all attendees, with apologies received from 5 panel members. Each attendee gave a brief introduction. • The next Stop and Search Scenario Day is taking place on Tuesday 20th August. More details will be circulated in due course. • There has been a change to the CSP theme cycle to enable the Constabulary to provide a more consistent level of scrutiny. From October, Stop & Search and Custody will swap therefore the meeting on Thursday 24th October will be Custody, with the next Stop & Search on Thursday 12th December. Use of Force remains the same. • The next S&S / UoF training session is scheduled for Thursday 22nd August. • The panel chair enquired as to whether the Right Care Right Person training had been delivered to Police Officers yet. The Constabulary were of the understanding that the Mental Health training has been rolled out and that the Right Care Right Person was likely to be towards the end of August.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair asked if the theme for the next Use of Force in August could be around mental health incidents however, the Constabulary advised that the data for this would not be available in August and therefore November would be a more appropriate suggestion. • The recent events of the Manchester airport altercation were discussed and a panel member asked if a similar incident were to occur in Cambridgeshire, would the panel be asked to scrutinise the footage. The Constabulary agreed and that it would be likely that an extraordinary meeting would be called to go through this. • If there were any other themes which had arisen nationally which were of interest to the panel, the Constabulary would be more than happy to bring these themes to future meetings. This is also included in the Terms of Reference.
Date of next meeting	Thursday 29 th August – Use of Force – Online via Teams

Please note, for the purpose of the minutes, the ‘Overview’ of grounds provided within each incident throughout this document are a summary of the original grounds provided. In addition, text added in bold are from the Constabulary which were provided during the meeting to provide clarity/context.

Incident 1			
Review Date:	25/07/2024	BWV reference:	SS/4104610957/8
Incident Date:	07/06/2024	Incident time:	12:00

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: A group of males were sat near a footpath which has been identified on BATS (a briefing system) as an area linked to drug dealing. On approach, one of the males moved their hands behind their back suggesting they could be hiding something.

Comments:

- BATS – CB clarified these are daily slides provided to officers on patrol which contain images and details of persons of interest along with intelligence on local area themes.
- Good written grounds.
- Very specific with inclusion of BATS intelligence number, which was used by the officer, along with visual suspicion to justify the stop.

Grounds RAG rating:	Green - 90% / Amber - 10%
----------------------------	---------------------------

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- It wasn't clear whether both officers identified themselves, 1 did but panel members were not sure about the 2nd officer.
- For safety, should officers have moved the suspect away from the group of friends as they could have been threatening. **There is an unpredictability when drink and drugs have been mixed. On this occasion, the group seemed calm therefore the officers wouldn't have seen a need for separating the group.**
- The officers didn't remove the subject's jacket which hindered the search, the officer could have asked the subject to remove this for ease.
- With safety in mind, at one point the female officer moved away therefore was unable to see what/how the male officer was doing.
- The officers were sympathetic and interacted with the subject and his friends.
- The officer risk assessed the situation well regarding the other people present during the search.
- Good search and interaction/communication with a compliant detainee. No need for handcuffs because of this.
- The PNC was checked.
- Cannabis was found on the subject and confiscated.
- The search was legitimate and helpful which might deter them in the future.
- The officers remained assertive but kept calm and friendly throughout.
- The search seemed to be a waste of time for what was found. **Reports/intelligence will have been received regarding drug use and the location therefore a local Inspector will go to a panel and report back that the public reported X and this is how the Constabulary have addressed it.**

Overall RAG rating:	Green - 100%
----------------------------	--------------

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 2			
Review Date:	25/07/2024	BWV reference:	SS/3071150780/13
Incident Date:	10/06/2024	Incident time:	15:15

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: The subject was seen by an officer smoking cannabis in the vicinity of Cambourne Doctors surgery in the company of four other youths. Upon officer(s) approach and request for them to stop, all individuals ran off from the location and headed toward the wooded area. Caught up with group and carried out stop search.

Comments:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good grounds that were clearly written • Grounds were detailed and gave a comprehensive review. 	
Grounds RAG rating:	Green - 100%

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers dealt with the situation well. • BWV was not switched on until the chase had finished. New updates to BWV mean that the BWV will start to capture the 30 seconds before record was pressed. When in the middle of an incident, it is easy for BWV to be forgotten initially. • Dealt with it well considering subject was shaken up and nervy. • It was a respectful search. • It was good that the officers assessed the subject and removed handcuffs as they were compliant and polite. • Good communication from the officers. 	
Overall RAG rating:	Green – 100%

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 3 (related to incident 4)

Review Date:	25/07/2024	BWV reference:	SS/3804937869/28
Incident Date:	06/06/2024	Incident time:	14:50

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: Whilst on patrol, officers have recognised a vehicle linked to the supply of Class A drugs. The vehicle was lost for a short amount of time; however it was located not long after parked in a road. Intel received stated that the occupants of the car are known for drug dealing. In light of this, the car owner has been detained for the purpose of a stop / search.

Comments:

- No comments

Grounds RAG rating: Green – 100%

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Clarification was given on how officers identify cars – intelligence will be looked at each day for areas to determine themes arising.
- Do areas get cleared up of issues or are they left alone so that these issues can be contained. **Areas are cleared up; however the perpetrators quite often move on. Therefore, the same approach is taken by the police in that they clear up the issue, but they move on again. Cars also change regularly, especially once a car has been identified as being linked to drugs.**
- The search on the female did not appear to be thorough enough. **It was likely that the search was not carried out to its full potential as the officers may have been trying to retain some dignity due to the female being pregnant.**
- A good and respectful search taking into consideration the female subject’s condition.
- GOWISELY was heard by some but not all. This could be because the BWV seemed to be turned on late therefore didn’t capture the full interaction.
- It seemed to be a slow introduction.

- Plain clothes officers out on foot will give intelligence to uniformed officers on activity seen.
- Female 2 was given too much space to wander around.
- There were several subjects detained but not everyone appeared to be informed of their rights.
- Items were put on the police car bonnet. **Officers encouraged to use evidence bags for searching so all belongings are kept together. There are 5 weeks of training for frontline officers soon therefore the use of evidence bags will be covered.**
- Entitlement to copy of search was not given.
- The officers present didn't appear to be working as a team. There appeared to be gaps with the officers on this interaction, they were not assertive or sure on who was detained and who was not. **Feedback will be given on lack of direction.**

Overall RAG rating:

Green – 30% / Green/Amber – 20% / Amber – 50%

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Actions arising:	Feedback:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback to be given to team on lack of direction. • Reminder of use of evidence bags 	<p><i>Eg - PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 5/7/23</i></p>
<p>Name:</p>	<p>Date:</p>

Incident 4 (related to incident 3)

Review Date:	25/07/2024	BWV reference:	SS/0540791631/31 & SS/3804937869/29
Incident Date:	06/06/2024	Incident time:	20:50

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: Whilst carrying out duties for an unrelated matter, officers have identified several members of the public as known drug users, all coming from the direction of Green Dragon Bridge. On approach to the bridge, officers have identified the same three subjects who were detained for a stop and search earlier in the day. Due to the location and reasons for earlier search, the subjects are detained once again for a stop search. N.B. Original grounds of this incident have been done in 2 separate parts.

Comments:

- Clarification was given on who the 'Persons A, B & C' were in relation to the earlier incident.
- In the grounds, it says drug 'users' however should they be referred to as 'suspected users'. **Sometimes officers do know that these people are drug users, but there should be more information in the grounds giving more detail as to how the officer knows this, such as appearance.**
- The grounds could have been a little more detailed.
- The first set of grounds were substantial and well written.
- The second set of grounds could have been more comprehensive.

Grounds RAG rating:	SS/0540791631/31 – Green 90% / Amber 10% SS/3804937869/29 – Green 50% / Green/Amber – 10% / Amber 40%
----------------------------	--

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Did the officers search under the bridge.
- The male suspect was heard saying to the officers that they were 5 minutes too late.

In light of this, was there no evidence of the remnants.

- Suspect implied that he had already smoked it.
- What help is in place for the pregnant suspect? It would be better to see a focus on them being helped rather than followed and searched. **A safeguarding referral will have been made through Protecting Vulnerable People (PVP) / Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH).**
- The officer did well not to react to situation.
- The search on the female was inadequate as per the morning search.
- The officer was sympathetic when searching the female but could have been more systematic.
- The search on the male was carried out well and diplomatically considering the difficult circumstances around the aggression of the male.
- No cuffs were used despite the male being quite irate.
- There was good communication by the officer.
- The officers were very calm and considerate.
- The male was agitated and very verbal but the female was more co-operative.
- The grounds were explained to the male but he didn't appear to be listening.
- The female officer developed a good rapport with the female.
- The whole situation felt a bit chaotic with lots of voices whilst the searches were taking place. The drugs could be a factor in why the voices were heightened.
- The parties involved could have been separated further from one another.
- The officer tried to de-escalate and did very well.
- Was this stop and search necessary.

Overall RAG rating:	Green – 80% / Amber – 20%
----------------------------	---------------------------

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

OPCC: Incidents 3 and 4 involved the same subjects, but took place on the same day, several hours apart. When reviewing incident 4, as the panel were aware of the outcome of incident 3, along with the number of BWV for each incident and the number of physical searches carried out, this brought an element of complexity to scrutinising these incidents.

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 5			
Review Date:	25/07/2024	BWV reference:	SS/3837134255/23
Incident Date:	03/06/2024	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?	
<p>Overview: Whilst on foot patrol along Gladstone Street officers have picked up on a strong smell of cannabis. Whilst trying to locate the source, the officers have seen a young male walking in the opposite direction smoking. The officers catch up with the subject and because of them being in possession of cannabis, they have detained the subject for a stop search.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good grounds 	
Grounds RAG rating:	Green – 100%

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- The outcome was that the cannabis was confiscated but NFA as the subject had just been released from prison therefore the officer's used discretion on this occasion which seemed proportionate.
- Officers were asking where the cannabis came from so there was some probing done to establish where the shop was the subject referenced.
- Good policing
- The situation was calm and the subject was compliant with the search.
- It was an effective and thorough search which took place and the officers had a good rapport.
- It was good neighbourhood/community policing.
- Was the search worth doing for just a joint – **The officers were right to challenge based on the fact the subject was smoking a joint whilst walking past police officers and in the street. Ultimately some intelligence was gained by interacting with the subject in the way in which they did.**
- At times it sounded like the officers were questioning the subject rather than having a conversation, could the fear be that if you don't answer, you are not complying? **It was clarified that you do not have to answer to questioning.**
- All videos have seen 'questioning' and the public do not appear to be aware that they do not have to answer the questions. The same can be seen when a stop search is taking place, officers do not make it clear that they do not have to give their information if they do not want to. It was common that innocent people were usually happy assist.

Overall RAG rating:

Green – 100%

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: