

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Scrutiny Panel

Stop and Search Capture Document

Panel date:	05/09/2023
Number of panel members in attendance:	7 active, one new member attending to observe ahead of completing training
Constabulary attendees:	Spt Robin Sissons, Sgt Ciaran Constable, Caitlin Bones (Ethics and Legitimacy Coordinator)
OPCC attendees:	Matilda Henry (Senior Policy Officer), Charlotte Murfitt (Office Manager)
Agenda item 1	Previous minutes: these have been circulated to all members and the Constabulary in advance of the meeting and no queries or comments were raised. The minutes of the 27 th June 2023 S&S panel were therefore agreed as an accurate record of the meeting and can be published.
Agenda item 2	<p>Actions from the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 23/02/21/2.1 from UoF on 21st February was discussed. This was regarding visits of Custody Suites being organised for panel members. KP explained that custody suite tours can be arranged, and conversation took place around whether this would be Thorpe Wood or Parkside. Either are doable and the Constabulary representatives confirmed this could be organised on request. Action can now be closed.
Agenda item 3	S&S scrutiny will follow within this document
Minutes & AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 1-minute silence was held at the start of the meeting in remembrance of Sgt Saville of Nottinghamshire. MH explained to all panel members that the September UoF panel session will be an online trial and therefore all members in attendance tonight needed to sign the revised

	<p>confidentiality agreement. All other members not present will be required to sign this ahead of attending online.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were two new panel members in attendance tonight so all members and staff gave an introduction for their benefit. • KP explained his recent experience at stop and search training, where the consensus was that none of the searches were thorough enough. As a result of this he has asked for all panel members to focus on the quality of searches that are scrutinised to ensure they are all thorough enough and to feedback where they are not. • KP shared the news that IOPC will be attending October meeting. • The panel were in agreement that the force will stop reporting on BWV availability and will report on exception where BWV is not available.
Date of next meeting	24 October 2023 – location to be confirmed

Panel date:	05/09/2023	BWV reference:	<u>SS/3254958029/2</u>
Number of attendees:	3	Incident date:	30/06/2023
		Incident time:	21:25pm

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>Comments: Overall yes</p> <p>Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:</p>

- Good written grounds
- Clear grounds
- Concise assessment
- Grounds good
- Very clear and reasonable

Grounds: RAG rating - Green

Grounds: Post-Video Assessment

Having seen the interaction does anything change in your grounds assessment?

Comments:

Panel members agreed that the written grounds match.

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Audio not at all clear

Strip Search

If a strip search was employed, was it at an appropriate location?	Yes / No
Authorised by a supervisor?	Yes / No
Audio recorded?	Yes / No

Comments:

N/A

Professional Standards / Ethics

Do you think the officer communicated clearly and demonstrated professional standards of behaviour (Code of Ethics)?

Comments made by panel members:

- Although the officer demonstrated professional standards of behaviour, according to the BWV there was very little communication with the detainee.
- Panel members commented that an evidence bag could have been used for the

items removed during the search rather than placing on floor where cash could have blown away. It was asked whether the use of evidence bags is mandatory when carrying out a search however RS confirmed there were no rules on this and it was at the officer's discretion.

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Poor communication
- Did not clearly identify himself, if at all
- Officer did not identify himself/police station
- Officer threw items onto the ground
- No use of evidence bags to safely store possessions – disrespectful if anything
- Virtually no communication when being searched
- Excellent search by officers
- No GOWISELY used

Overall, was the encounter

Justified	Yes	Comments from panel members: The officer could have been more courteous and friendly towards the suspect.
Proportionate	Yes	
Necessary	Yes	
Ethical	Yes	

GOWISELY	Tick if you can hear this stated	
Grounds	✓	It was decided by the panel that at no point on either BWV could it be heard the officer introducing himself.
Object	✓	
Warrant card (if not in uniform)	X	Subsequently their identity wasn't confirmed, the station based at or an entitlement to receipt offered.
Identity (name & number)	X	
Station (they are based at)	X	
Entitlement to receipt form	X	Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject not made aware
Legal power used	✓	
You are detained for the purpose of a search	✓	

Additional Body Worn Video (for other officers in attendance) if applicable

The time on the additional footage was an hour earlier than the recorded time for the stop and search (20:23pm on additional footage).

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

During the search, there were several items that it was felt weren't scrutinised by the officer enough, possibly a mobile phone battery and a tin containing something white. The mobile battery was questioned but wasn't unwrapped to verify.

Some panel members thought it was a good stop and search and that the officer found many items implying it was very thorough.

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Good search and items found
- Good Stop and Search
- Should have used an evidence bag when searching. Cash including notes were thrown on the ground.
- Lack of communication
- Why did the suspect have an old mobile battery?
- What was in the old rizler tin?

RAG rating: Green 1, amber 5

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

The overall rating of amber by the majority of the panel members is reflective of the conversations held on the evening. Feedback needs to be passed on to the Officer for awareness and continuous improvement.

Actions arising:

Feedback:

Constabulary to discuss face masks not being lowered at next BCH meet.	<i>PC XXX and their supervisor Sgt XXX emailed feedback 13/9/23</i>
--	---

Panel date:	05/09/2023	BWV reference:	<u>SS/0397468423/4</u>
Number of attendees:	2	Incident date:	01/07/2023
		Incident time:	23:30

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>Comments:</p> <p>All were in agreement that clear grounds were given, no further comments were discussed before watching the BWV.</p> <p>Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate S&S on articles found on male • Good grounds • Poorly written, no real link up to CCTV and justification for identifying the individual. • Good written grounds • More info on the situation – other group members?
Grounds: RAG rating
All in agreement that the grounds are green apart from one panel member who felt they should be amber, but nothing of concern.

Grounds: Post-Video Assessment

Having seen the interaction does anything change in your grounds assessment?

Comments:

Panel members agreed that the written grounds match.

One member raised an issue with the way in which the grounds were written – they said there should be more information on the group that had been identified on CCTV, rather than just saying ‘a group’. CC confirmed that others in the group were also subject to S&S but that the BWV for scrutiny was only on this one. RS explained that the expectation of officers is for them to keep grounds specific to the one individual subject to a search not the while group in a situation such as this.

Conversation took place around whether the subject was more nervous than you would expect for a young person being stop and searched.

The issue around timing recorded was discussed as the video was one hour later than the time that was recorded on the grounds. CC confirmed that this is partly due to the officers writing reports up after shift, so they are an estimate. KP identified that at Monks Wood, every BWV looked at was 1 hour ahead of time. **RS confirmed that he would take this as an action to look into.**

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Time given is one hour after actual time of video
- Camera and recorded time not the same

Strip Search

If a strip search was employed, was it at an appropriate location?

Yes / No

Authorised by a supervisor?

Yes / No

Audio recorded?

Yes / No

Comments:

N/A

Professional Standards / Ethics

Do you think the officer communicated clearly and demonstrated professional standards of behaviour (Code of Ethics)?

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Yes
- 'Put your foot on my knee', other than this the officer seemed to cope very well. The other officer present seemed to have no involvement.
- Good, clear communication

Overall, was the encounter

Justified	Yes	Comments from panel members: All in agreement that it was justified, proportionate, necessary and ethical.
Proportionate	Yes	
Necessary	Yes	
Ethical	Yes	

GOWISELY	Tick if you can hear this stated	
Grounds	X	Comments: Officer was in uniform, so warrant card not required.
Object	X	
Warrant card (if not in uniform)		
Identity (name & number)	X	
Station (they are based at)	X	
Entitlement to receipt form	X	
Legal power used	X	
You are detained for the purpose of a search	X	

Additional Body Worn Video (for other officers in attendance) if applicable

Comments from panel members:
N/A

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

- Excellent search
- Good stop and good communication
- Search was very thorough

- Not handcuffed
- Good rapport with suspect
- Good search and good communication while searching

RAG rating: 7 green (one member arrived in time for this BWV and missed the first)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Good grounds and good search carried out. No issues to raise. Recurring theme was the good communication and rapport of the officer.

Actions arising:	Feedback:
Constabulary to investigate issue with time for BWVs all being 1 hour out at Monks Wood.	<i>PC XXX and their supervisor Sgt XXX emailed feedback 13/9/23</i>

Panel date:	05/09/2023	BWV reference:	<u>SS/3656898789/1</u>
Number of attendees:	2	Incident date:	02/07/2023
		Incident time:	9:55am

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?

Comments:

Some panel members had trouble following the grounds and found them slightly confusing due to the depth and redaction. However, it was also commended how thorough the grounds were given the complexity of the situation.

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Grounds were confusing to read
- Difficult to understand - possibly because the situation was complex
- Very good, a good effort
- Good grounds
- Very complete, full justification is given

Grounds: RAG rating

Green

Grounds: Post-Video Assessment

Having seen the interaction does anything change in your grounds assessment?

Comments:

- One panel member said the grounds were 'exemplary' having now seen the footage.

Strip Search

If a strip search was employed, was it at an appropriate location?

Yes / No

Authorised by a supervisor?

Yes / No

Audio recorded?

Yes / No

Comments:

N/A

Professional Standards / Ethics

Do you think the officer communicated clearly and demonstrated professional standards of behaviour (Code of Ethics)?

Comments made by panel members:

The panel agreed that this was a yes. The officer showed empathy and was very professional throughout.

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Officer communicated clearly

- PC very professional
- Yes, although he wasn't cautioned regarding the attack on ambulance staff
- Very empathetic

Overall, was the encounter

Justified	Yes	Comments from panel members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The officer had very good awareness of the individuals circumstances.
Proportionate	Yes	
Necessary	Yes	
Ethical	Yes	

GOWISELY	Tick if you can hear this stated	
Grounds	Y	Comments: Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An excellent demonstration.
Object	Y	
Warrant card (if not in uniform)	Y	
Identity (name & number)	Y	
Station (they are based at)	Y	
Entitlement to receipt form	Y	
Legal power used	Y	
You are detained for the purpose of a search	Y	

Additional Body Worn Video (for other officers in attendance) if applicable

Comments from panel members:

N/A

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

An in-depth discussion took place regarding the physical search. There were concerns by one member due to the pic lines / tubes on the patient. The panel member questioned whether a medic should have been present during the search due the medical issues of the suspect. As there was a threat that the suspect was carrying a knife it wouldn't been appropriate/safe for the paramedics to carry out that search.

One member asked if the suspect should have been handcuffed. It is up to the officer to risk assess at the time and they might use factors such as age, threat level,

circumstances to make this decision.

One member thought it unnecessarily agitated the suspect when the police officers spoke to the paramedics first rather than the suspect. It was thought to be insensitive to discuss the situation in such close proximity to the suspect.

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- The officers were personable and friendly.
- Should the officer have helped the suspect stand up in case of injury to the suspect?
- Very thorough.
- Good communication and treated suspect with humility and respect as clearly an incident involving mental health or severely stressed.
- Good communication, all explained but doubt the suspect understood
- Good job by Police Officers
- Thorough frisk search
- Query on assault of ambulance staff

RAG rating: 6 green and 1 amber

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Overall this was a good example of S&S. The one rating of amber was as a result of feelings that the officer was a little insensitive with how they dealt with the suspect. Otherwise very positive feedback to be shared with the officer.

Actions arising:	Feedback:
Excellent feedback on NDM practice to be shared with Officer. <u>Done as part of email 13/9/23.</u>	<i>PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 13/9/23</i>

Panel date:	05/09/2023	BWV reference:	<u>SS/1833749385/1</u>
Number of attendees:	2	Incident date:	06/07/2023

		Incident time:	20:10pm
--	--	-----------------------	----------------

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?
Comments: All in agreement that the grounds were clear, no additional discussed before watching the BWV.
Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appropriate S&S on articles found on male• Good grounds• Good grounds and concise comments• Sufficient and justified• Good grounds• Sufficient grounds
Grounds: RAG rating
Green

Grounds: Post-Video Assessment
Having seen the interaction does anything change in your grounds assessment?
Comments: Conversation took place around the location of the search, but not issues with the grounds after having watched the BWV.
Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jacket off – vehicle search. Thorough search and good banter by the officers.• Good interaction• Good rapport with group

Strip Search	
If a strip search was employed, was it at an appropriate location?	Yes / No
Authorised by a supervisor?	Yes / No
Audio recorded?	Yes / No
Comments: N/A	

Professional Standards / Ethics
Do you think the officer communicated clearly and demonstrated professional standards of behaviour (Code of Ethics)? Yes
Comments: Panel members noted good rapport of officers with subjects of S&S. One panel member raised the location of the S&S and questioned whether it would have been better to move to be the other side of the car for the protection of all involved.

Overall, was the encounter		
Justified	Yes	Comments from panel members: All in agreement that it was justified, proportionate, necessary and ethical.
Proportionate	Yes	
Necessary	Yes	
Ethical	Yes	

GOWISELY	Tick if you can hear this stated	
Grounds	X	Comments:
Object	X	
Warrant card (if not in uniform)	X	
Identity (name & number)	X	
Station (they are based at)	X	
Entitlement to receipt form	X	
Legal power used	X	
You are detained for the purpose of a search	X	

Additional Body Worn Video (for other officers in attendance) if applicable
Comments from panel members: N/A

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The location of the S&S was the main issue discussed. The Stop and Search took place in a lay-by but the officers and suspects were in between the 2 cars.</p> <p>Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent job although nothing found. • Good stop, good rapport • Should have been moved to side of the road – risk! Tags still in jacket of subject. • Officer communicated well and was forming a good rapport with the subject
RAG rating: 7 green

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:	
All panel members were in agreement that this was a thorough search and that the Officer created a good rapport with the subject.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
	<i>Sgt XXX & Insp XXX emailed feedback 14/9/23</i>

Panel date:	05/09/2023	BWV reference:	<u>SS/2698381555/6</u>
Number of attendees:	1	Incident date:	05/07/2023
		Incident time:	15:00pm

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?	
Comments: The overall consensus was that the grounds were clear and concise.	
Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concise grounds • Good grounds • No driving licence or insurance wouldn't increase the suspicion of being in possession of drugs and that maybe that was irrelevant. • No fault with grounds 	
Grounds: RAG rating	
Green	

Grounds: Post-Video Assessment	
Having seen the interaction does anything change in your grounds assessment?	
Comments: No additional comments, grounds match what was seen.	

Strip Search	
If a strip search was employed, was it at an appropriate location?	Yes / No
Authorised by a supervisor?	Yes / No
Audio recorded?	Yes / No
Comments: N/A	

Professional Standards / Ethics
Do you think the officer communicated clearly and demonstrated professional standards

of behaviour (Code of Ethics)?

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- The officer had a relaxed approach
- It was excellent and well done to the officer.

Overall, was the encounter

Justified	Yes	Comments from panel members: N/A
Proportionate	Yes	
Necessary	Yes	
Ethical	Yes	

GOWISELY

Tick if you can hear this stated

	Y	Comments:
Grounds	Y	
Object	Y	
Warrant card (if not in uniform)	Y	
Identity (name & number)	Y	
Station (they are based at)	Y	
Entitlement to receipt form	Y	
Legal power used	Y	
You are detained for the purpose of a search	Y	

Additional Body Worn Video (for other officers in attendance) if applicable

Comments from panel members:

N/A

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:

One panel member asked if the suspects were cuffed as officer was alone. Safety for the officer was one contributing factor, along with that some of the grounds being that the officer suspected drugs at supply level, by handcuffing the suspects, it can prevent them from swallowing anything.

It was thought there was a risk for the officer taking into consideration the remote

location, number of suspects although back-up had been called. This was confirmed as you could see nearby backup in the background of the BWV and that he had been in communication with them.

It was also discussed, the placing of the officer and suspects during the exchange as they were between the 2 cars.

One panel member raised the location of the S&S and questioned whether it would have been better to move to be the other side of the car for the protection of all involved. CC explained that the officer in this BWV is a traffic officer and is therefore more comfortable there than others may be, but appreciated the risk associated with it.

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Compliments to the officer for their handling of the situation.
- Good coverage.
- Asked for assistance.
- Considering there were 3 people with driving issues, the officer did very well.
- The officer communicated well.
- Very relaxed approach.
- The stop and search was excellent and the officer had a good rapport with the suspects.
- Why was the officer on his own?
- One member would have expected a call for assistance. **This was confirmed to have happened.**
- Single crewed, could have been dangerous, high risk to the officer.
- Good stop with good communication
- Very calm.
- What happened to the car following the stop and search? **CC confirmed it was seized due to no insurance.**

RAG rating: Green – 7

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

All in agreement that this is green and that positive feedback is to be shared with the officer. Concern was discussed around the positioning of the interaction, but this has since been addressed across the force by email from RS which the OPCC are sighted

on.	
Actions arising:	Feedback:
Constabulary to look into positioning of members of public and Officers during road traffic stops.	<i>PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 14/9/23</i>

Panel date:	05/09/2023	BWV reference:	<u>SS/2306638239/2</u>
Number of attendees:	4 and then an additional 2 arrive	Incident date:	11/07/2023
		Incident time:	18:40pm

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>Comments:</p> <p><i>No comments discussed before watching the BWV.</i></p> <p>Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male? Burglary of old home? • Concise grounds • Very reasonable • Good grounds • Good written grounds • Well written
Grounds: RAG rating
Green

Grounds: Post-Video Assessment
Having seen the interaction does anything change in your grounds assessment?

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- 4 Police Officers talking to a rambling guy. Any proof he did something? He had capacity. Detained for S&S, report of trying to gain entry.
- Good rapport but concerned he has pens in his hand, mental health concerns
- Officers could have dispersed.
- Slow but good communication

Strip Search

If a strip search was employed, was it at an appropriate location?	Yes / No
Authorised by a supervisor?	Yes / No
Audio recorded?	Yes / No

Comments:

N/A

Professional Standards / Ethics

Do you think the officer communicated clearly and demonstrated professional standards of behaviour (Code of Ethics)?

Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:

- Officer conducting the search – very good. She also sought advice from a colleague.
- Cant understand the length of engagement, way too long getting to the point.
- Other officers could have helped

Overall, was the encounter

Justified	Yes	Comments from panel members: All in agreement that it was justified, proportionate, necessary and ethical.
Proportionate	Yes	
Necessary	Yes	
Ethical	Yes	

GOWISELY

Tick if you can hear this stated

X

Comments: Officer was in uniform

Grounds	X	so warrant not necessary
Object		
Warrant card (if not in uniform)	X	
Identity (name & number)	X	
Station (they are based at)	X	
Entitlement to receipt form	X	
Legal power used	X	
You are detained for the purpose of a search		

Additional Body Worn Video (for other officers in attendance) if applicable
Comments from panel members: N/A

Comments, concerns and/or compliments from panel members:
<p>One panel member noted that the interaction seemed disproportionate due to there being 6 officers and 1 subject. Conversation took place around the necessity to handcuff. RS confirmed that it is personal preference and the fact that this could be good practice given the officer was a probationer. It was also explained that what couldn't be seen in the BWV is that there were sharp objects on the ground at the scene such as scissors etc and therefore handcuffing enhanced officer safety.</p> <p>Notes from assessment sheets as recorded by panel members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The male was very compliant, he showed no aggression to anyone. The S&S was a complaint that he was trying to break into his old home. No evidence of that. • There is a van there, why not search him in there? But good S&S • Why so many officers in attendance? (response to potential break in?) • Clearly an individual with mental health issues, PC coped very well given their obvious lack of experience • Too many police officers • Trainee Officer, concerned as to why so many officers present and making her do all the work. Potential bullying? • Were handcuffs necessary when 6 officers were present as subject was not agitated or abusive.

- Search carried out by a probationer who communicated well.

RAG rating: 5 green, 2 amber (disproportionality and positioning of subject were the reasons given for this)

Chair's comments and OPCC Summary:

Conversation took place on the status of the female officer, CC confirmed that she was newly qualified which was why she was referring to the more senior officer on whether she could carry out the S&S or not.

The mental health nurse arrived on scene towards the end of the viewed BWV and the initiative that the Constabulary now have with a mental health nurse on shift for late shifts was explained to the panel. All were very complimentary of this service and appreciative of the positive impact this would have on policing.

Actions arising:

Feedback:

Feedback to be passed to the officers involved.

PC XXX & Sgt XXX emailed feedback 13/9/23