

SUFFOLK POLICE POWERS PUBLIC SCRUTINY (SPPPS) MINUTES

Date: 05th June 2024
16:00 - 18:00

Location: Via Teams

Number in attendance: 24

Chair - Phaniel Mutumburi

Minute Taker - Travis Dickerson

Attended:

PHANUEL MUTUMBURI (PM),
SHARON LEE (SL), TRAVIS
DICKERSON (TD), FRANSTINE
JONES (FJ), JON CHAPMAN (JC),
STACEY RUCIMAN (SR), CLAIRE
CONNICK (CC), HEIDI DIX (HD),
NEVAEH WINTLE (NW), SIMON MILLS
(SM), DAVID BROWN (DB), STELLA
FRANGLETON (SF), DIONNE MOHAI
(DM), ELLIE HARPER (EH), EMILY
PLUMRIDGE (EP), MICHAEL STAINES
(MS), MEG SHEPPARD (MS), TIM
PASSMORE (TP), JULIE BARKER (JB),
JACK STAFFORD (JS) SHAWN
REYNOLDS (SR) JAMES BATES (JB)
PETER SADLER (PS) , DIONNE
MOHAI (DM).

Welcome – All Welcomed by the Chair

Introductions – All members introduced themselves

Minutes from previous meeting –
Minutes signed off

SPPPS – PM provided an update regarding the change from SSRG to SPPPS to the group.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 1:

371716/130324/115751

ISCRE Comments:

The officer records that the suspect is known to the police for class A drug dealing. How recent is the latest intelligence? At this search, nothing was found resulting in no further action. Was this person stopped because they were known to the police? Date of intelligence would assist. Wanted to review the BWV to see/better understand the search, but not available.

Grounds:

See:

I was conducting a Pulse patrol at LANDSEER PARK, IPSWICH as directed in briefing. As I approached the entrance to the park on CLAPGATE LANE, I saw a male and a female exiting the park. I recognised the male as xx who is well known to Police for dealing class A drugs. I recognised the female but did not recall her name.

Know:

I am aware that LANDSEER PARK is currently designated as a pulse patrol area and has a dedicated briefing slide. I am aware that xx has an extensive history in dealing class A drugs.

Suspect:

I suspected that xx may have been in the park to conduct drug dealing and suspected that he may in possession of class A drugs.

Discussion:

FJ: What is pulse patrol?

JC: Pulse patrol is an area that has shown concern from the public. Officers tasked around these areas would expect to see activity.

This is not the first time we have not been able to view the BWV. What is the reasoning for this?

SM: In October, we introduced a new digital asset management system (DAMS) for all our digital media, including body-worn video and CCTV. We extended the retention period for stop-and-search recordings from 28 days to three months to match the retention of personal data in forms. Officers now need to request retention manually, unlike before when footage was automatically deleted after 28 days. Communication about this change was unclear, causing some issues. I now manage body-worn video operations, including usage and device updates. DAMS currently records footage under device numbers, not officer numbers, making searches difficult. We're working to improve this system and resolve these issues. Progress is slow, but ongoing.

JB: What does the officer mean when he says "extensive history in dealing class A" also was the officer alone? If not, could we see another officer's BWV?

SM: I can confirm this officer was alone.

JC: Regarding Intel we don't have a definitive time frame around that intelligence. We can go back further and find this out.

PM: There may be extensive intelligence going back years but that is not strong enough ground to stop and search.

Actions:

SM - Possibility of adding some information to the website that explains how body worn video is retained.

PM - Could we have some further information regarding the intelligence.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 2:

371304/010224/182338

ISCRE Comments:

Request to review BWV.

Is the suspect male or female? Column G states female yet grounds refer to male? The grounds would benefit from more detail. What was suspicious about this car for it to be stopped when it appeared the police were interested in the passenger? Was there intelligence on the driver/car, was the driver of the car searched?

Grounds:

See - male passenger in vehicle seen to make an exchange with people earlier in the day. Stopped later and arrested for supply cocaine

Know - male known for drug use and arrested

Suspect - drugs were in vehicle and that another exchange likely to occur

Discussion:

PM: I can see on the form that the item searched for was not found but the individual was arrested for drugs. Also, the contradiction of the individual being male, or female shown on the form. The officers need to articulate their grounds with further detail.

JC: I have been made aware this situation is part of an on-going operation which adds some complexities. There needs to be much greater detail within the see/know/suspect model to provide further grounds.

SM: Regarding the mixed messages on the form I would suspect that drugs have been found in the vehicle that have not been attributed to anyone and therefore all the occupants have been arrested.

FJ: Are there any other forms relating to this incident? The form overall is confusing. Also is there a section on the form to allow us to know if this incident is under operation?

JC: I think it comes back to the see/know/suspect. With some more articulated grounds this would be much easier to understand.

SM: We have trained that if officers know an incident is under operation to put that in the "Know" section within the grounds.

JB: I can see on the form that one black female was searched. As mentioned, it was possible that it was a larger group, if so was anyone else searched? And if so, what was their ethnicity? A response to this to be provided.

Actions:

JC: Further feedback regarding the form and questions asked and not yet answered.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 3:

371630/210324/234551

ISCRE Comments:

Was any consideration given to this being a malicious call? Did this male live locally? Was a knife found in the vicinity. What was the response from the suspect? Handcuffs were used, it would have been useful to have seen for how long they remained on the suspect etc. BWV not available.

Grounds:

SEE: On police arrival subject was located on the driveway of Severn Road and matched the description given by the infmt (mixed race male, black bandana, black tracksuit).

KNOW: Police recieved a call from a MOP reporting that a male was in running up and down the Severn Road brandishing a large knife. Male was described as mixed race, wearing a black bandana and a black tracsuit. 18/19 years old and athletic build. Just prior to police arrival male was reported to be stood on the driveway of 41 Severn Road.

SUSPECT: Subject was not holding anything/did not obviously appear to be in possession of a knife but given the information provided to police it was suspected he may be in possession of a knife so a search was conducted.

Discussion:

FJ: How old is this individual? I wonder if vulnerability had been considered.

JC: This induvial was born in 2002.

I have a response from the officer: A public report described a man matching the subject's description running with a large knife, trying to attack others. I Arrived within minutes and found the subject on a specific driveway, matching the description and location. The subject is known for violent offences and gang involvement.

Initially detained for a search, no weapon was found. The subject claimed he was a victim of an aggravated burglary, picked up a knife in self-defence, and handed it to a family member before police arrived. CCTV confirmed he was trying to attack others, and he was arrested for affray.

Responses to queries:

- Yes, the subject lived locally at the address where he was found.
- The knife was given to a family member who took it inside.
- The subject admitted having the knife for self-defence due to an aggravated burglary.
- Reports of a person with a knife in the street, especially a known offender, are treated as genuine.

PM: Regarding the possibility of this being a malicious call. What is the guidance around that for the control room, as we have had a case of this before.

SM: As head of the control room in Suffolk, I've emphasised that we assess all incoming information. For anonymous calls, such as reports of a group with a knife, we scrutinise further by checking for multiple reports or additional details. Our well-trained staff evaluate the information to decide its credibility. If we only respond to clear threats, we'd miss many critical incidents. We follow a process considering threat, harm, and risk to determine deployment.

Actions:

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 4:
AFI - 3712580

ISCRE Comments:

We cannot see evidence of verbal or visual warnings given before the use of Taser, as that is not explained in the narrative. Describe what you mean by aggressive and threatening manner, what were his actions and words etc?

As no weapons were physically seen and information received from the informant could pertain to any one of the males, is this sufficient justification for the use of Taser when other personal safety equipment was readily available?

Is 'preventing disappearance' always a reason to use Taser in nonviolent situations?

Reasons for Use of Force:

Effect Arrest
Effect Stop & Search
Prevent Escape
Protect Other Officers
Protect Self
Secure Evidence

Discussion:

SR: It was mentioned that the police scrutinise tasers, is this a panel of officers? And where did this incident take place? I am wondering if due to limited space the Individual attempted to run away but seems as if he was running towards the officers. Is it safe to use a taser in a dimly lit space?

JC: I have had a response from the officer stating the officer said "Stay where you are, stay where you are" before using the taser. The officer was not sure if the individuals had weapons. The officer was made aware beforehand that individuals have been seen with power tools. Due to this, taser was used to prevent injury to myself or colleague and to prevent disappearance of the subject. There's no requirement for weapons to be physically seen to justify the use of Taser. STO's Specialist Taser Officers are regularly sent to incidents involving more than one suspect, where they must consider the use of Taser based on limited information. Also, this instance involved more than the officer preventing disappearance.

JC: I can confirm the use of taser in ill lit spaces is fine due to a torch being attached to taser along with a red-dot laser sight. We have been made aware the incident took place in a car park, so an amount of limited space was most likely not a factor. Scrutiny is done by the Taser Training Team. These are lead officers who scrutinise each deployment taser is used.

SM: To add to the taser security, for us to have a license to utilise Taser, we must provide scrutiny and that is why the Taser trainers provide that level of scrutiny.

Actions:

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 5:

Use of Force No.69

ISCRE Comments:

'd/p had hands around neck very tightly'

Clarification - Assuming this is not hands around the officer's neck - it is not clearly stated.

If it is hands around own neck - We are trying to understand why such force was used because of the D/P's actions. It is difficult to understand what level of harm the person could genuinely cause themselves to warrant the need of force where they are pinned to the ground with officer's body weight? Ground Pinning , Body Weight Ground Pin,

Were verbal de-escalation techniques used before the use of force?

BWV is not available as officer states they were not issued with one.

Reasons for Use of Force:

Prevent harm to subject

Discussion:

FJ: Was this person having a mental health crisis? We can see this individual is on the autism spectrum BWV should be available to show the evidence as to why this amount of force was used.

SM: This is not an officers use of force but a detention officer, and detention officers, level of training is very different to police officers in so much as our training for our custody staff is based on detainee wellbeing and welfare. When we have somebody who is suffering some form of mental breakdown and has put hands around their neck, there is a strong possibility if they're suffering, such as strength of mental breakdown that they can cause themselves from significant harm. And therefore, we're duty bound to respond to that.

Regarding BWV we don't issue our detention officers body worn video because custody is covered in its entirety by CCTV.

SR: It was mentioned training for detention officers is different. I am wondering what training to detention officers have when dealing with some with mental health issue or autism?

SM: I was trained in the autism passport as were all the people at the time that that was brought in July. The point regarding appropriate adults the answer is yes, if someone had to have an appropriate adult while in custody, we would allow that.

FJ: I don't believe custody is the current place for individuals with learning difficulties or autism. How is this dealt with?

SM: Legally, custody isn't ideal for vulnerable people, but sometimes it's necessary. If we must detain someone due to legal requirements, we provide appropriate well-being care in custody. For children, we avoid overnight custody whenever possible, but if arrested late at night, they may stay until morning. Vulnerable individuals may be held short-term while we assess their needs. Since we can't diagnose conditions, medics in custody determine if someone is safe to detain. If not, they are transferred to a mental health team at a local hospital.

NW: To add I have taken individuals with autism into custody, and I can confirm the staff take extra precautions and do their best to keep them calm and can move them into separate rooms as a cell can be very daunting.

Actions:

AOB:

SL: There some action points which we need to ensure that we get the responses on, can we please get the responses from the police before the next meeting. All actions and responses will be recorded in the minutes.

Regarding the final form, we can bring it to the next meeting as ISCRE were able to view the BWV and we have some questions regarding that.

Date of next Meeting:

Wednesday July 31st

Meeting ended at 18:00.