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

**Date: 31st January 2024, 04:00 – 06:00 (Via Teams)**

**Chair: Franstine Jones (FJ)**

**Minute Taker: Travis Dickerson (TD)**

**Presenting:  Sharon Lee (SL)**

**Attendee Names: Travis Dickerson (TD), Angelina Quamina (AQ), Jonathan chapman (JC), Claire Connick (CC), David Brown (DB), Franstine Jones (FJ), Naomi Lofthouse (NL), Simon Mills (SM), Sharon Lee (SL), Naomi Lofthouse (NL)**

**Total – (9)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Welcome:** | **All welcomed** |
| **Introduction and purpose of the meeting:** | Introductions |
| **Previous minutes and former actions** | No former actions, previous minutes approved. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review of Forms** | **ISCRE Comments** | **Scrutiny Discussion & Comments** | **Action by whom & when** |
| **Form 1 –** 371909/221023/202859  I had seen the male put a white substance towards his nose whilst being highly intoxicated and walking into the road | BWV was reviewed by ISCRE prior to the SSRG meeting.    Grounds are poorly recorded. Where was the officer and suspect when this was seen (proximity)? Was the suspect approached immediately? Where did the suspect take the white powder from? i.e. a pocket or a bag? Nothing was found, NFA, was there any wrapping that the white powder came from? Please update us. | CC: For the group to have a better understanding from the BWV, three individuals were walking down the road coming from a themed event, they were all clearly highly intoxicated. A woman was heavily engaged with the officers while they are attempting to talk to the man mentioned in the grounds. Shortly after an older gentleman comes over and engages with the officers in a non-helpful way. Comments such as “Do you want to buy some drugs?”. It was seen the man mentioned in the grounds had a white substance down his jumper.  SM: Grounds are certainly weak, followed by a lack of control seen on the BWV. It seems to me the officer has made the decision to search but not following it through with intent I think we could have arrested this individual with the information present during the stop. The lack of control is reflected on the form. | Feedback to officer. |
| **Form 2 -** 371075/061023/015146  CAD - SC-06102023-11, Reports from an informant to say a male in a white hoodie has passed a knife to a male in an orange hoodie. IBC CCTV have identified the individual and have given his description which included a orange hat and orange jumper. When I have arrived, I have been pointed to this individual by MOP wearing what IBC have previously described. I have detained under suspicion that he is still in possession of this knife. | BWV was requested by ISCRE but was not available.  Did CCTV operator always have site on the person? If yes, was the suspect seen disposing of the knife as nothing found. It appears the initial report came from a MOP, did they maintain constant site of the suspect? | CC: I can confirm a member of the public has approached security to say they have seen a male in a white hoodie and balaclava to have a knife, this male has passed the knife to another individual in an orange hoodie. IBC CCTV had identified a male who has matched description with the orange hoodie. This male has been seen to approach a bin and drop an unidentifiable object within the bin. CCTV maintained vision on this male and identified this male to police upon arrival.  FJ: Why is there no BWV available?  CC: I contacted the officers to find out what name the BWV has been saved under in the new system.  I suspect this transfer of systems has caused some officer to use it incorrectly.  SM: This new system allows officers to upload BWV and then flag the upload as a stop and search. The BWV will then be retained for three months. To add to CC’s response, the BWV for this case was deleted due to insufficient software with this new system.  FJ: What training do officer receive on this new system? Failure of training could result in a lot of lost BWV.  SM: For this example, the BWV never went through to the new system due to the software which means it was deleted after 30 days. This was not an officer training issue but a system issue.  SL: The original form could have had more detail and clarity to be in a position where we don’t need to ask as many questions.  SM: Yes, I agree. The issue with this one for me is the format. If see/know/suspect was used it would have provided a better image.  FJ: Did the supervisor have any comments?  SM: A response from the supervisor is as followed:  “I can see that whilst the information for the see/know/suspect format has been captured it is not clear as it could have been. Feedback has been given to the officer for future submissions. |  |
| **Form 3 -** 375042/191023/155411  Intel reported to police of drug dealing from Silver skoda GY62 MYU to 4 males at SHIRE HALL YARD. Previosu reports of drug dealign in this area. On arrival 4 males present fitting descriptions given. | BWV was reviewed by ISCRE prior to the SSRG meeting.  Poorly recorded and unclear grounds for this stop & search. Supervisor’s comments are noted. | SM: The location of this area is known for ASB and is reported from the public a fair amount. Our response to this is situation is appropriate.  The process of GOWISLEY I think was poor. It was not structured correctly as one officer was giving GOWISLEY while another is taking it slower and engaging with the individuals. The whole group should have gone through GOWISLEY together. A question we asked was around the handcuffs. There was a large amount of interaction before handcuffing this only took place as the search was conducted. There was no real reason as to why handcuffs were used this way. A positive I would like to take from this is the engagement between the officers and the group.  CC: The officer responded with the comment: “Unfortunately due to nerves on this occasion I have made errors that I will not on my next stop and search”.  This was his first stop and search.  FJ: Was the group searched? Or only the one individual.  SM: The group was searched. They admitted that they had some contact with the vehicle, but it was not located in the area |  |
| **Form 4** - 370157/091123/222635  **Grounds:** Police receive a report from an anonymous member of public that 2 females had been seen in a black BMW X5 dealing drugs close to locus and they had also been seen to point a gun at another member of public. The driver was described as having blonde hair wearing a black North face puffer jacket and the passenger said to be short and in her 30s. A full Firearms authority has been given for armed officers to try and locate the vehicle and search it and the occupants. The vehicle was located and followed to locus, where it was stopped. The subject was the front seat passenger of the vehicle. She was detained and searched; however, the search was negative. It later transpired that the report was believed to be malicious. | BWV was reviewed by ISCRE prior to the meeting.  Was it a single report that the person was dealing drugs and carrying a firearm or was there other intelligence to support police actions. Was there any intelligence on the vehicle?  When and how did it become apparent that this was a malicious call? What the outcome for this suspect? | SM: From the information received there was a positive duty for us to respond. Once the vehicle was located weapons were pointed at the car. A discussion that took place once the officers knew that there are children in the vehicle, how quickly can they de-escalate the situation. From what we saw, this was dealt with very well, weapons were packed away, it was determined that what was present was not corresponding with the initial call. One of the females present made it clear “This was her ex-partner that has done this”. The ex-partner had also made a call to the fire service later that evening and was arrested. For me this is now how efficient the officers determine the situation to be not as they expected and derail the situation. I believe the officers de-escalated the situation well by giving GOWISLEY and then talking with the children to explain the situation.  SL: I agree with that Simon, given the difficultly of the situation it was dealt with accordingly. |  |
| **Form 5 –** 370598/211123/111429  Male identified in possession of an axe and was seen walking off down Hadleigh road.  Axe left at the scene but unknown if he had any further items on him due to working on a builder’s site. | The grounds for this search lack clarity. Who was the male identified by? Did the male have the axe in his possession when stopped? If not, was the male stopped where the axe was found. Did the axe belong to him, was it a part of his working tools? Can we please have clarity on the grounds for this search. | CC: Unfortunately, I am not able to provide an update as this case is subject to a PSD investigation.  **Professional Standards** | SM: Once an updated is provided we can bring this back to the group. |
| **Form 6 -** 370424/031023/134808  Seen: Male driving a Ford Focus on A14 east bound, coming off at Bedingfield Way in Bury St Edmunds.    Known: The vehicle the male was driving was linked to multiple intel reports within the last 3 days linking the vehicle to the supply of cocaine within Bury St Edmunds. The vehicle was insured to a male in Staffordshire.    Suspect: That the male had travelled from out of country to Bury St Edmunds to supply cocaine. | Good stop & search clearly recorded. Detailed, yet succinct. | SL: This is a strong form to demonstrate that all the key information can be added to a form in a compact way. |  |

**AOB:**SM: I would like to talk about a discussion myself and Phanuel have been having. We are looking to convert from a stop and search reference group to a Police Powers scrutiny group. This will mean we will broad out our scrutiny from not just stop and search but use of force outside of the stop and search environment. This will not mean we will lose stop and search and the benefits from this group but now be able to incorporate use of force and taser.

It is planned for March 27th to be the final stop and search reference group. The meeting in May should be the first Police Powers scrutiny meeting.

FJ: My issue has always been disproportionately. I have seen some numbers rising within Suffolk regarding disproportionately and I want to make sure we don’t revert ourselves back to 2009.

Discussion took place regarding disproportionately within Suffolk.

**Meeting comes to an end 5:58pm**

**Dates for 2024 SSRG Meetings,** March 27th, May 29th, July 31st, September 25th, November 27th