

**Stop & Search Reference Group (SSRG) Minutes**

**Date: 28<sup>th</sup> February 2023, 16:00 – 18:00 (via Teams)**

**Chair: Franstine Jones / Phaniel Mutumburi**

**Minute Taker: Travis Dickerson**

**Number in attendance: 16**

Sharon Lee (SL), Robert Smith (RS), Dion Thorpe (DT), Travis Dickerson (TD) , Darren Alderson (DA), Phaniel Mutumburi (PM), Savi Tyndale (ST), Andrew Pursehouse (AP) , Daniel Peck (DP) , Tim Passmore (TM) , Matthew Paisley (MP), Simon Mills (SM), Stella Frangleton (SF) , David Brown (DB), Carlos Walker (CW), DeSousa Maria (DM).

|                                     |   |   |             |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|
| Welcome:<br>Introductions & Actions | All members of the group introduced themselves. | All actions from the previous meeting have been completed and shared at this meeting. | Simon Mills |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|

| Item  | Discussion/Response   | Response  | Action by whom & when  |
|---|---|---|--|
| Review of Forms: <b>GROUNDS</b>   |   |   |  |
| <p><b>ID- 370436/051022/111646</b></p> <p><a href="#">Agitated and restless state, not confirming the movements of the vehicle even though we have ANPR activations telling us where they are. Admitted to being cannabis used.</a></p> <p>SL: These are not clear grounds for a stop &amp; search. Can we please have the grounds clarified. This has been picked up by the supervisor. This was a difficult form to scrutinise.</p> | <p>SM: This was one of the forms we looked over and discussed in the body worn video review. We are attempting to start to at least bring one or two forms from the SSRG to the body worn video review.</p> <p>FJ: I can see the use of handcuffs; how did it escalate to this?</p> <p>SM: This was brought up in the body worn video review and was discussed, so perhaps Phaniel could assist with this and add some further context.</p> <p>PH: The form mentioned the suspect being agitated, but what I gathered from the body worn camera video review was that he was very compliant and followed instructions. In this situation the use of force with handcuffs was not justified from the body worn video. This raises the issue that the write up on the form was not congruent to what we saw from the body worn video. I think this form further shows how important it is that the reviewed forms are accompanied by body worn video. As we could have a situation where an officer fills out a form that does not reflect what happened on the ground.</p> <p>FJ: I think this also raised the question as to why officers feel the need to use handcuffs, especially if people are complying. It feels almost like an abuse of power.</p> | <p>SM: The officer has given a response and it is as follows: I was with the sentinel team on an attachment, while on Fordham Road in Newmarket I ran the vehicle through OPTIC which provides information that it was linked to drug dealing. We stopped the vehicle and confirmed that the driver related to the same driver on the OPTIC input. The driver was acting suspiciously and agitated, looking around and being fidgety. The male admitted to recently using cannabis. There was information held that the male was previously involved in supplying controlled drugs. From that I suspected the male to be in class B drugs. I then conducted a section 23 search of the male and vehicle.</p> <p>SM: I would like to add for some reassurance, the body worn video review recordings were not seen by me before the meeting. As it's important I can provide my first observations. I agree with Phaniel that the use of handcuffs did not need to be used. I would also like to add some further details regarding this form. The officer was a student officer and asked the experienced officer who investigated the stop if they should use handcuffs and her response was yes. What we are saying to officers is; that it is your justification, it is your force and that you need to determine whether that is the correct way to conduct the search. To add to this, we are now teaching officers there is only one instance where you can pre-emptively use, use of</p> | <p>FJ: asked SM for:<br/>I would like some data regarding the decrease in the use of handcuffs. And, ethnicity, the decrease for black people and other ethnicities.<br/>And the outcome rate of stop and searches.</p> <p>SM: The find rates for the article in which we are looking for is currently 25.3%. This means if we are looking for drug that's the percent, we would find drugs after a search.</p> <p>The percentage for females is at 27.3% but keep in mind there a large sample of males searched.</p> <p>When we have searched for something but found something else this is at a 35.8%. For example, we expect they may have drugs, but we find a knife. And for females It is at 39.9%, These are present by quarters.</p> |

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   | <p>ST: I am just concerned that student officers are using handcuffs. Are they trained to use them? I feel as if the use of handcuffs is a highly developed skill and that the officers should be fully trained.</p> <p>CW: Is there a perception of the suspect from the officers as they have intelligence that the vehicle was involved in drug dealing?</p>               | <p>force and that is if you believe imminent danger to yourself or other.</p> <p>SM: Yes, I agree Savi. To add some clarity, student officers undertake a period of classroom-based learning and then will learn all the skills to be a police officer. Then they will support a tutor officer for a period then become independent. In this situation it is most likely the officer's first or second stop and search and the other officers are there for support. The student officer asked the question "Should I handcuff him" and the experienced officer says "I would". So, this is why we are getting that message across that's it's the officers' own rationale as to why they have to use force because they would be the ones who would have to stand in court and explain what use of force legislation.</p> <p>SM: Officers should not predetermine how they are going to deal with an individual unless we have intelligence or previous grounds to go off, for example intelligence of violence or escape.</p> | <p>FJ: Do you have the find rates for ethnicity?</p> <p>SM:</p> <p>For the Asian population 64% is negative and 36% is positive.</p> <p>Black is 68% negative and 32% positive.</p> <p>Mixed is 51% negative and 46% positive. There is a slight discrepancy there.</p> <p>No know/ Not state is 69% is negative and 29% positive.</p> <p>Other 73% negative and 24% positive.</p> <p>White 60% negative and 38% positive.</p> |
| <p><b>ID - 371787/081122/100530</b></p> <p><a href="#">Recent intel received male dropping drugs off in Norfolk.</a></p> <p>SL: The grounds for this stop and search lack detail. How recent was the intel, what were the antecedents leading up to the stop, NFA so assume nothing was found. More details</p> | <p>PH: I think what was just explained could have been articulated in the ground as there is a big gap to what Daniel has provided when compared to the grounds on the from.</p> <p>When you say the vehicle has recently been involved in drug drop was there hard evidence? If so, what was done when this information was found out and why action was not taken then.</p> | <p>DP: The update from the officer is as followed: An ANPR action flagged on the white van. There was intelligence within the last four weeks showing that the van had been seen at a car park in Diss Norfolk where it made a drop to a male who comes out and deal drugs on the wall. The man is there every week or the carpark opposite and makes the drop. There are three occupants in the vehicle heading from Cambridgeshire towards that location and the driver was arrested for drug driving, therefore had</p>  |  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>required, was GOWISELY used during this stop &amp; search?</p>  |   | <p>used cocaine recently. A positive drug wipe and the intelligence formed the grounds to a section 23 misuse of drug search. All three occupants were searched on the basis the driver may have passed something on. Nothing was found.</p> <p>SM: This can be complex as we are discussing intelligence and how we obtained that intelligence. Intelligence could come from a variety of sources such as a member of the public following crime stoppers all the way to what we call a covert human. Intelligence is then graded for offices. We just need to be careful on the source of the intelligence we are acting on and whether that opportunity has risen before.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>ID - 370529/031222/034315</b></p> <p>Area is known for possession and dealing, upon approaching the vehicle there were four males in a car and when they have brought the window down it smelt strongly of cannabis.</p> <p>SL: Not enough information in the grounds for this search. Why was the vehicle approached? The lack of grounds has also been identified by the supervisor. Handcuffs also used in this search.</p> | <p>PM: I would just like to challenge the fact this could be a fishing expedition. The stop and search as it states on the grounds the officer was only aware of a vehicle being parked in an area known for drugs and was only made aware of the smell of cannabis when approaching the vehicle. How should the officer have written the grounds?</p> <p>SM: I have been doing work around how can we best encourage officers to write their grounds in a way which is meaningful. A new model for the forms has been introduced which is the: &gt;See &gt; Know &gt; Suspect model. The "See" is what has been observed, either by an officer for a third party and what are the circumstances that surround that observation. The "Know" is for what do they know. What does our intelligence check say? What do we know about the area? What does our tasking say? Why are we there in the first place? And the "Suspect" is, what is suspected from the individual</p> | <p>SM: I would like the group to hear some comments from the supervisor: "Having read though the circumstances and the result quite clearly the search found drugs and was therefore the correct decision. However, the grounds state the smell of cannabis was present. However how as this know you state the area is known for drugs. How recent is the intelligence? What is the area? Is it the actual car park? These are things I would like to see on the grounds."</p> <p>DP: This individual was not found with any drugs on his person, but another person involved in the search was found with drugs. The officer's response is as follows: We noticed a car parked alone near to Woodbridge at 2am on an active patrol, upon parking behind the vehicle the driver attempted to manoeuvre and leave the car park, but it was blocked in. The driver was hesitant to put the window down when we approached the vehicle, the vehicle was very steamed up with all the windows shut. When the window fell there was a strong</p> |  |

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>or group. If this was applied to the grounds on this occasion it would provide a much better understanding.</p>   | <p>scent of cannabis. The car had five males inside between the age of 17 to 20. A check was done and no investigations or recent intel around cannabis for any of them. When speaking to the males they did not engage in conversation and didn't make eye contact. This caused the officer to feel as though they were probably under the influence. A small amount of cannabis was found which one male admitted ownership. The officer has also acknowledged feedback from the supervisor.</p>   |   |
| AOB  | <p>PH: I would like to discuss an issue in the Ipswich area that has arisen recently. I would just like to bring this to the group as there are many people out there who are currently concerned with some issues. They mentioned large groups of people speaking in their native language, and people loitering in town, they expressed this makes some members of the community scared. What I am concerned about is the response from the police being if they see these people they will "move them on" and I am thinking how does this work? We would not want the police to be used by people who may have negative views on the community and to do their bidding.</p> <p>CW: I would also like to add the sense of safety in the town centre since the incident. I am sure people are aware officers are now seen simply walking up and down the town centre.</p> | <p>SM: Some things that need to be considered are that there are parts of Suffolk that are under public spaces protection order, so there are specific requirements that are in place because of that order. I think the terminology "moving them on" does not give a full context of what we are trying to achieve. We need to be conscious of the language we use.</p> <p>TP: Just to add the importance of engagement and understanding different backgrounds cultures when it comes to a situation like this. Those who are fortunate to have this knowledge or be a part of a leadership position need to spend as much time as possible explaining to people who have these perceptions that just because a large group are gathered and wherever they have come from its not illegal and that lack of understanding is big problem in this situation.</p> | <p>CW: Is it possible to see some statistics regarding how many ethnic minorities were stopped during the time of the section 60 put in place after the incident?</p> <p>SM: Yes, this can be provided.</p> |
| <b>Next Meeting:<br/>March 29<sup>th</sup> 4-6pm</b> |  |  |   |