****

**Stop & Search/UoF continuous improvement – External Panel**

**Thursday 14 July 2022**

**6.00pm**

**ATTENDEES**

Christopher Cottam (CCo) - Chair

Clinton Smith (CS)

Dean Roscoe (DR)

Hinnaa Iqbal (HI)

Nichola Grimshaw (NG)

IN ATTENDANCE

Ian Dickinson (ID)

Mark Douglas (MD)

Steven Montgomery (SM)

**APOLOGIES**

Colin Carter

Paul Hudson

Alan Price

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

The Chair reminded members of the panel to consider whether they may have to

disclose to the meeting knowing any individuals or officers in relation to any matters under consideration on the Agenda.

**REVIEW OF STOP SEARCH AND ASSOCIATED BWV**

The Panel considered 5 Stop and Search Cases chosen by an algorithm. In each case, the panel were shown an incident log, stop and search form(s) and BWV where available.

The panel reviewed incident 1 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Officer carried out his duties correctly
  + The grounds and object were clear.
  + Legal powers were explained, and police station identified.
* **Additional information**
* The officers were polite and professional and demonstrated how a stop and search should be carried out. It was noted that the officer did not wear gloves. The Panel were advised that officers are trained to undertake a search safely and are encouraged to wear gloves. However, it was noted that gloves would not prevent needles penetrating the skin.

The panel reviewed incident 2 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Thorough search no issues raised.
* **What did not go well**
  + -

**Additional information**

* The BWV was switched on when the search was already underway, therefore, there was no clarity around the use of GOWISELY. It was agreed that the BWV should have been switched on sooner as it was valuable for the panel to see the interaction. It was noted that the suspect had numerous drug pipes on his possession. The Panel was advised that it was not an offence to possess a pipe, but it was an offence to supply. It was also noted that the suspect had a sim card in his possession which again was not an offence, but suspicious.

The panel reviewed incident 3 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Search power and object correct
  + Clear explanation around GOWISELY
  + Officer re-emphasised the availability of the Stop and Search form at the conclusion of the interaction.
* **What did not go well**
  + -

**Additional information**

* + The panel noted that there was no incident log for this case. The Panel were advised that logs were not created for every in every case. The panel noted from the case note that the stop and search was undertaken based on intelligence and asked if it was correct searches to be undertaken randomly. Chief Inspector Douglas advised the Panel that there was no such thing as a random stop and search. Officers must have reasonable grounds. The panel noted that the suspect was very mature for his age and credit must be given for his demeanour which prevented the situation from potentially escalating when known associates tried to intervene. It was clear the officer cared about the community and the individual as he explained about county lines and sought assurances from the individual that he wasn't being pressured into something he didn't want to do.

The panel reviewed incident 4 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Officer had taken the time to understand the situation by talking to all those involved before undertaking the Stop and Search.
* **What did not go well**
  + The Stop and Search form indicated that no other officers were present but there were. This may have assisted in identifying other footage of the Stop and Search and wider incident. Officers in the house had activated the BWV but those involved in Stop and Search didn't appear to have. The Stop and Search form indicated that an object was found but no evidence of this from the BWV.

**Additional information**

BWV did not show early interaction around GOWISELY

The panel reviewed incident 5 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Search went well until the knife was found
* **What did not go well**
  + Poor audio from BWV.

**Additional information**

* + It was noted that legislation had changed for the suspect to request a paper or electronic copy of the full record from the police station that the officer was from within 3 months of the stop or to make a complaint. It was noted that previously this was 12 months.

**SECTION 60 AUTHORITIES SINCE THE LAST MEETING**

The Panel were reminded that Section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 allows a senior police officer to authorise constables to stop and search persons in a specific area, either where a serious public order problem is likely to arise or has taken place, or for offensive weapons or dangerous instruments.

The Panel were informed that one Section 60 Notice had been issued since the last meeting.

The Section 60 Notice was authorised in the Longridge area on the 10 June 2022, after reports of two gangs of males wearing balaclavas and carrying bats and an axe. It was noted that a section 34 dispersal order was also invoked.

No Stop and Searches were undertaken as a result of the Section 60. However, the axe was recovered and there was no further reports pf disorder.

Upon been advised of all the facts of the incident the panel supported the proportionate approach taken by Lancashire Constabulary.

**UPDATE ON RIDE-A-LONG**

It was anticipated that the individuals would be invited to observe the Section 60 in place in Longridge in June. However, the Section 60 was only in place for a limited time, and it was therefore considered unsuitable to call out the panel members.

Both Hinnaa and Clinton indicated that they wished to be invited to observe a future ride-a-long.

**REVIEW OF USE OF FORCE**

The Panel considered 5 Use of Force Cases chosen by an algorithm. In each case, the panel were shown an incident log, Use of Force form(s) and BWV where available.

The panel reviewed incident 1 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + First Officer handled the situation well and maintained control throughout.
  + Powers communicated to individual
* **What did not go well**
  + Second Officer handled it less so but did back off and allow the first officer to take lead.

**Additional information**

* Whilst the panel acknowledged that a dangerous weapon was possibly involved it was accepted that using terminology such as 'you chose this' was not appropriate.

The panel reviewed incident 2 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Proportionate actions by the police officer
* **What did not go well**
  + **-**

**Additional information**

* + **-**

The panel reviewed incident 3 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Lawful and justified actions by the police officers in the main.
* **What did not go well**
  + Male Officer is offensive and inappropriate language whilst placing the suspect in handcuffs.

**Additional information**

* + Personal Opinion and offensive language is not appropriate and should be feedback to the arresting officer via the BCU SMT and dealt with through internal process**.**
  + Concern was raised regarding the use of raised voices by a female officer which the panel though lead to the officer being head butted. It was noted that such tactics can assist in de-escalating a situation but not always

The panel reviewed incident 4 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Lawful, reasonable and proportionate actions by the police officer.
  + Outstanding paperwork
  + Correct and justified use of force.
* **What did not go well**
  + **-**

**Additional information**

* + **-**

The panel reviewed incident 5 with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
  + Female officer gave clear directions and instructions throughout the incident.
  + Justified course of action.
* **What did not go well**
  + **-**

**Additional information**

* + Suspect clearly resisted arrest. He made himself out to be the victim, but his actions said otherwise.
  + The panel sought clarification on the term 'prior knowledge'. Chief Inspector Douglas explained that this could mean the suspect was known to the police, there were warning markers against his name or that having viewed the CCTV officers already knew he had assaulted an individual.

**COMPLAINTS DATA AND CONCLUSION**

The Panel received a presentation in relation to complaints.

The panel were advised how members of the public could make a complaint to Lancashire Constabulary and the mechanisms by which a complaint would be resolved and reviewed.

It was noted that between the 1 April and the 30 June 2022 Lancashire Constabulary recorded 356 complaints. Of those complaints 5 complaint related to a Stop and Search and 16 related to the Use of Force.

In response to a question from the panel it was agreed that officers would look at identifying any trends or timeliness issues associated with the complaints and report back to the October meeting.

Mrs Angela Harrison

**Chief Executive**