



Stop and Search, Use of Force and Continuous Improvement Panel

Wednesday, 15th January, 2025, 6pm

Connolly Room, Police Headquarters

PRESENT

Mark Hindle (MH) (Chair)
Stephen Donnell (SD)
Connor Eastwood (CE)
Paul Entwistle (PE)
Glenn Ireland (GI)
Keith Kirby (KK)
Marcus Naylor (MN)
Reece Richards (RR)
Clinton Smith (CS)
Debbie Storr (DS)
Gillian Strachan (GS)

IN ATTENDANCE

Chief Supt Chris Hardy (CH)	Lancashire Constabulary
Jon Campbell-Smith (JCS)	Lancashire Constabulary
Rozila Kana (RK)	Lancashire Constabulary
Anna Hopkins (AH)	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Ian Dickinson (IDD)	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Richard Harrison (RH)	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Amy Robertson (AR)	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

1. Welcome and Introduction from the Chair

The Chair welcomed all in attendance.

Due to the time constraints experienced at the last meeting, MH informed members that Officers would alternate between Stop and Search and Use of Force cases throughout the meeting. He also reminded members to be concise when providing feedback, to support the Panel's ability to receive as many cases as possible within the time allocated for the meeting.

AH, Chief Executive for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, was in attendance to observe the meeting and introduced herself to the Panel.

2. Apologies for Absence

Hamza Foy (HF)
Chris Hopkinson (CH)
Paul Hudson (PH)
Halima Karbhari (HK)
George Stewart-Moss (GSM)
Amanda Wooldridge (AW)

Lancashire Constabulary

3. Declaration of Interest

Panel members were reminded of the need to consider and disclose any declarations of interest relating to any individuals, officers or matters under consideration.

No declarations of interest were disclosed.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 16th October 2024

The minutes were agreed to be a true and accurate record.

5. Actions from the previous meeting

An action log was shared with members for discussion and updated accordingly.

ACTION 1: It was agreed that the interim Chair, MH, would feature in a video highlighting the role of the Panel.

ACTION 2: CH informed the Panel that no operations, where it was believed a stop search was likely, had taken place since the last meeting. He noted that he would keep the Panel informed of any future operations whereby member attendance would be considered appropriate.

ACTION 3: JCS informed the Panel that the force followed College of Policing guidance in relation to the retention of email addresses of those subjected to a Stop and Search.

ACTION 4-6: AR had been advised prior to the meeting that actions 4-6 had been completed. The Panel were informed that case feedback would be provided at item 8.

ACTION 7: It was noted that MH would attend the internal Stop and Search and Use of Force meeting for the foreseeable.

ACTION 9: It was noted that a survey would be circulated to the Panel prior to the next meeting in April, asking members to provide their reflections and feedback on the 2024/25 Stop and Search, Use of Force and Continuous Improvement Panel meeting and outcomes. The responses of the survey would be collated by the OPCC to produce a formal report to be presented at the next meeting.

ACTION 12: Members were asked to contact AR should they wish to observe Personal Safety Training.

ACTION 14: It was noted that an update would be provided at item 13.

ACTION 16: CH was comfortable that through training, officers were reminded to be aware of public perceptions in relation to stop and search and use of force (through Public Safety Training). The Panel were informed that case feedback would be provided at item 8.

ACTION 17: The Panel were informed that case feedback would be provided at item 8.

ACTION 18: Members were asked to contact AR to outline their preferences as to how they would like the complaints data to be presented.

ACTION 19: Prior to the meeting, CH had confirmed that officers did receive training around mental health. It was suggested that arrangements could be made for the mental health lead for the force, to provide an input to members if they thought this would be useful. Members were asked to contact AR to outline the input they wished to receive regarding officer mental health support training and the right care right person scheme.

ACTION 20: AR observed the CPD training day held on the 15th November. CH noted that additional CPD days were due to be arranged and that member attendance would be considered.

6. Review of 4 Stop and Search Incidents and associated Body Worn Video

The Panel considered 3 Stop and Search Cases. In each case, the Panel were shown an incident log, stop and search form(s) and BWV where available.

The Panel were unable to receive Stop and Search incident 1, as the retention period of the Body Worn Video had lapsed and as such, was no longer available to view.

*The Panel reviewed **Stop and Search Incident 2** with the following outcomes:*

Panel Member's Observations and Comments:

It was noted that incident 2 was a Stop Search of Vehicle and Person, rather than a Person Only search.

What went well?

One panel member felt that officers had maintained a good demeanour, remained calm and had built a good rapport with suspects.

What did not go well?

Officers had not followed GOWISLEY in the correct order.

One of the officers had their hands in their pocket which could be perceived by the public as unprofessional.

Comments

RR asked officers to outline the grounds for the Stop and Search. It was noted that the car in question had a police marker for the supply of cannabis.

One member asked whether the driver and all three passengers had been subjected to a Stop and Search. It was noted that in the incident log associated with the case, officers had recorded that whilst the two males were searched, they were unable to undertake a search of the female suspects due to there being no female officer in attendance to conduct the search.

RR felt it was extremely important for the Panel to review and scrutinise Person and Vehicle Stop Searches in particular, due to potential disproportionality in relation to Stop and Searches

(Vehicle and Person) of Ethnic Minorities. RK acknowledged comments and noted that the force was looking into disproportionality in relation to vehicle and person searches.

Officer Comments:

It was felt that Officers should have introduced themselves formally and, as a minimum, advised the suspects which station they were based at.

In addition, it was noted that whilst officers had collectively informed suspects that they were undertaking a Stop and Search for drugs, as Stop and Search is an individual power under GOWISLEY, the officer conducting the search should have individually reiterated to suspects that they were conducting a search.

*The Panel reviewed **Stop and Search** Incident 3 with the following outcomes:*

Panel Member's Observations and Comments:

What went well?

One member felt that the officer conducting the search seemed to be experienced in dealing with suspects who were in an emotional state.

What did not go well?

One member felt that it did not seem appropriate to conduct the search in the middle of a car park. Whilst JCS acknowledged the members comments, he informed the Panel that police regulations stipulate that a search must be conducted as near to the incident as possible.

Members felt that placing the suspect in handcuffs did not seem appropriate as they did not seem to pose a physical threat to officers.

One member felt that the supporting officer seemed disengaged as he had one hand on the bicep of the suspect and one hand on his waist. It was noted by the Panel that this could have negatively impacted public perception.

Officer Comments:

It was noted that the purpose of a Section 23 Search was to determine whether a suspect had been involved in criminality. Therefore, JCS informed the Panel that officers should have used Section 32 powers, as the suspect had already been caught shoplifting.

CH agreed with the Panel that the supporting officer seemed rather disinterested. In addition, he noted that a Use of Force form had not been completed by officers despite handcuffs being applied.

The Panel reviewed **Stop and Search** Incident 4 with the following outcomes:

Panel Member's Observations and Comments:

What went well?

One member felt that the Stop and Search was good overall.

What did not go well?

It was noted that the officer conducting the search did not have gloves on.

It was felt that officer/s should have provided more of a detailed explanation as to why a search was being undertaken.

Officer Comments:

In relation to the grounds for conducting the search, CH informed the panel that a knife had been found in the locality and that the suspect had matched the description provided by a witness.

7. Review of 4 Use of Force Incidents

The Panel considered 4 Use of Force Cases. In each case, the Panel were shown an incident log, stop and search form(s) and BWV where available.

The Panel reviewed **Use of Force** Incident 1 with the following outcomes:

Panel Member's Observations and Comments:

What went well?

One member praised the Officer's communication with the suspect.

What did not go well?

The Panel noted that the officer had asked the suspect to 'get off my wrist' eleven times before handcuffs were applied. It was felt that if handcuffs had been applied earlier, the officer could have applied pain compliance to maintain control of the situation. Whilst one member felt the communication had been good, other members felt that communication required improvement.

It was noted that the Officer and suspect had been shouting at each other throughout the incident. The Panel felt that this gave the impression that the Officer/s did not have the situation under control.

Members noted that the suspect had hold of the arresting officer's wrist and as such, asked why the supporting officer did not provide more timely assistance.

The Panel felt that more force could have been used to ensure the incident was kept under control.

Officer Comments:

It was felt that communication was effective in the beginning and that officers seemed to have the situation under control in the early stages of the incident. However, it was noted that the suspect should have been advised immediately that they were under arrest.

It was noted that the supporting officer was a new student, which may explain their lack of timely intervention. Whilst this was acknowledged, CH noted that the inactivity of the supporting officer was an area for improvement. It was noted that on the BWV, it was heard that back up had been requested.

However, it was noted that whilst the incident could have been handled more effectively, the officers had achieved the objective of handcuffing the suspect and putting them in the police van.

Officer's agreed that overall, more force could have been used.

It was noted that 67% of officers were under three years in service and as such, the force had been undertaking work to manage the risks posed. RK noted that the force had been working with new recruits to educate them on the realities of policing to better equip them in dealing with real-life police emergencies and conflict.

The Panel were assured that newly recruited officers were only provided sign-off to attend police incidents when considered to be completely ready.

The Panel reviewed **Use of Force** Incident 2 with the following outcomes:

Panel Member's Observations and Comments:

What went well?

The Panel noted that the Officers had been careful about leaning on the suspect throughout the incident.

What did not go well?

One Panel member felt that the incident was over resourced.

Another Panel member raised concerns about the suspect's safety when left unrestrained in the Police van. It was felt that the suspect could have harmed themselves when left unsupervised.

Officer Comments:

It was noted that the individual was suspected to be experiencing Acute Behavioural Disturbance (ABD). The Panel were informed that when dealing with such instances, restraining suspects posed significant risks. The officers in the footage had discussed whether they felt the individual was experiencing ABD which may explain the lack of use of force.

CH noted that officers had carried the suspect to the police vehicle in line with police protocol. However, he agreed with the Panel that the suspect should have been supervised in the police van via the internal cage and that the suspect should have been placed in a position whereby they were unable to harm themselves.

Members felt it would be beneficial to observe the layout of a police van to understand the tactics used by officers when detaining suspects. In addition, members felt it would be useful to receive an input regarding the application of handcuffs and use of restraint equipment.

ACTION 21: At the next meeting, members to be provided with the opportunity to observe the layout of a police van.

ACTION 22: CH/JCS to provide an input to members regarding the application of handcuffs and use of restraint equipment.

The Panel reviewed **Use of Force** Incident 3 with the following outcomes:

Panel Member's Observations and Comments:

What went well?

The Panel felt that the Officer had handled the incident well and remained very calm.

ACTION 23: Members requested that the Officer be provided with positive feedback regarding their handling of the incident.

Comments

It was noted that the suspect was male with suspected dementia.

RR noted that the officer did not shout at the suspect and felt that it may be beneficial for officers to adopt this approach when dealing with suspects of a younger demographic to prevent escalation. However, he acknowledged the police would be required to consider their approach on a case-by-case basis.

RR suggested that the case could be used as a case study in training to demonstrate best practice when dealing with vulnerable adults.

Officer Comments:

CH noted that the force was looking to develop technology to record incidents from the point of view of the suspects to be used as training material.

JCS acknowledged that an estimated 40% of incidents the police attended involved individuals experiencing mental health crisis. It was noted that whilst officers received training around supporting those experiencing mental health issues, they were not subject experts.

The Panel reviewed **Use of Force** Incident 4 with the following outcomes:

Panel Member's Observations and Comments:

What went well?

The Panel noted that the Nurse maintained a good rapport with patient.

What did not go well?

GS noted that the Officers were shouting at the individual and felt this may not have been helpful to de-escalate the situation. In addition, she felt that using terms such as 'calm down' may not have been the most useful means to achieve the desired outcome.

In addition, GS queried whether the application of handcuffs was necessary and whether asking the individual to place themselves on their knees was appropriate, considering they had been detained under the Mental Health Act.

One member queried why the police had been in attendance as they felt the hospital staff could have dealt with the incident considering they were trained in restraint tactics. With this in mind, it was suggested that it may be beneficial to discuss the case with Lancashire Care.

Officer Comments:

JCS informed the Panel that police assistance was requested as the individual had left the hospital whilst detained under the Mental Health Act.

RK noted that it would be useful to publish the Panel's comments and suggestions via Lancashire Constabulary's 'People's Voice' intranet website. It was felt that it would be useful for officers to have input around alternative approaches to dealing with policing incidents from members, especially considering the professional expertise and lived experience of the Panel.

8. Case Feedback from Previous meeting

Due to time constraints, the panel were unable to receive case feedback from the previous meeting.

9. Stop and Search Data Update

A summary of the Data Sub-Group meeting had been circulated to members prior to the meeting.

10. Section 60 Authorities Since Last Reported to the Panel

There were no Section 60 Authorities to review in the period since the last Panel meeting

11. Ride Along Scheme Update

Item 11 was discussed during delivery of the action log.

12. Complaints Data

Due to time constraints, the panel were unable to receive an update on complaints data.

13. Meeting Format and Future Considerations

The Panel agreed that alternating between Stop and Search cases and Use of Force cases throughout the meeting was useful and requested this format be followed at future meetings.

Mindful of the time constraints faced, the Panel requested that written updates be provided on the action log prior to the meeting, with any verbal updates provided only when required.

14. Date of next meeting (to be held at 18:00 hours)

Wednesday, 16th April 2025.