

SUFFOLK POLICE POWERS PUBLIC SCRUTINY (SPPPS) MINUTES

Date: May 27th 2026

**Location: Microsoft
Teams**

Number in attendance: 13

Chair - Sharon Lee

Minutes Taker - Travis Dickerson

Welcome - All Welcomed by the Chair

Minutes from previous meeting - Minutes from previous meeting signed off.

SPPPS - Former Actions: Former actions were reviewed

Review of Forms

Attended:

- Sharon Lee (SL)
- Phaniel Mutumburi (PM)
- Aleksandra Kasinska (AK)
- Travis Dickerson (TD)
- Casey Elizabeth (CE)
- David Brown (DB)
- Kate Fitzsimons (KF)
- Franstine Jones (FJ)
- Chris Hinnit (CH)
- Becky Mears (BM)
- Shawn Renyolds (SR)
- Abigail Ward (AW)
- Angelina Quamina (AQ)

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 1: Stop and Search - 370443/150326/213906

Grounds for stop/search:

SEE: The person searched was in the immediate area following an incident where someone matching their description was seen with a handgun. KNOW: Member of the public reported a group of 3 to 4 bikers in the area one road over aircraft road was riding a scooter in all black and has threatened her with a handgun. SUSPECT: Whilst conducting an area search for these bikes we have come across two males with bikes on Garrick way they have matched the description of young men in all black outfits with hoods and both were riding scooters. At this point we have had to take action to confirm the presence of the handgun so both males have been stop and searched under 47 of the firearms act.

ISCRE Comments:

How long after the initial report was this male stopped? Can we review the BWV to get a better understanding of why this male was stopped.

Discussion:

BWV was reviewed by ISCRE

EC: Advised that armed officers responded to the incident within approximately 10 minutes of the call being received. It was armed officers due to the nature of the call.

CH: Explained his role as the Strategic Firearms Commander on this case and the process for reviewing and authorising firearms deployments. Stating that two males on mopeds matching the description from a reported firearms incident were stopped and searched, which was considered justified and proportionate based on the intelligence available at the time. As no further relevant suspects were identified and time had passed, the operation was appropriately stood down to avoid unnecessary searches.

PM: Stated that while it could not be confirmed that the individuals stopped were those sought by police, the timing and circumstances made the stop and search reasonable. The panel also noted that officers remained calm, professional, and proportionate throughout the firearms-related incident.

FJ: Questioned what further action police would take following a public report of a handgun, given that the stopped individuals were not those sought and no weapon was found.

BM: Explained that firearms authorities are tightly controlled and time-limited due to public confidence and risk considerations. They noted that while calls can range from genuine firearms incidents to hoaxes or imitation weapons, armed deployment is only maintained for a short period—typically around an hour—once immediate searches and stop checks are completed, unless there is clear justification to extend it.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 2: Stop and Search - 371716/050326/165801

Grounds for stop/search:

SEE: While on mobile patrol I saw a group of youths at the end of HATTON COURT which runs between TAVERN STREET and OAK LANE, next to IPSWICH MINSTER. As my colleague stopped the car, a member of the public pointed towards the alleyway, drawing my attention to it. I exited the car and walked along HATTON COURT as 2 males approached me. I asked them what they were doing and XXX said they were 'just chilling'. No further details were given. I noticed he appeared out of breath and sweaty and I asked why to which he gave no definitive answer. I recognised XXX from previous dealings for class C drug possession. I requested his details and ran him through control room which returned recent intel for drugs possession from January 2026. I detained him for a search at this point.KNOW: I knew that a group of youths had been in an alleyway that is known for criminal activity such as drug taking and violence. I entered the alleyway and was encountered by a male youth who appeared out of breath and sweaty who gave no reason for this or his presence in the area. I have previous professional experience of the male for drugs possession and gathered recent intel via a person check for drugs possession. I knew that a group of people had been gathered in the area prior to my arrival and that the group had dispersed at this point.SUSPECT: I suspected that XXX was in possession of either drugs or money that had been received for supplying drugs. I suspected that XXX furtive behaviour was due to this.

ISCRE Comments:

What was the MOP pointing to the alleyway about, drawing attention to what?

How recent is the intelligence of youths using the alleyway for criminal activity and violence?

Can we review the BWV of this search as the grounds do not appear to be reasonable for the initial stop. I also understand the suspect is 15 years old and permission was not sought to search although obtained retrospectively.

Discussion:

BWV was reviewed by ISCRE

CH: Explained that the officer was waved down by a member of the public and directed into an alleyway where two males were found out of breath, in an area known for drug use and dealing. The officer used this context, combined with local intelligence and knowledge of one individual linked to drug supply, to form grounds for a stop and search, although they did not initially seek supervisor authorisation, which was later identified as an oversight.

Noting that the officer acted in a direct but appropriate manner and had demonstrated learning from previous scrutiny, including improved communication during searches and consideration around handcuffing. A retrospective review and internal scrutiny confirmed the grounds were later validated and highlighted some positive professional development in the officer's approach.

SL: Described the body-worn video showing the officer engaging with a young person and asking if he had been in a fight due to appearing out of breath, with another young man present questioning the stop and asking why they were being searched. Noting that the individual being searched was a 15-year-old white male and no items were found. Reporting no concerns with the conduct of the search itself, other than the officer not initially seeking authorisation, which was identified as an issue.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 2: Stop and Search - 371716/050326/165801

Discussion:

BWV was reviewed by ISCRE

FJ: Questioned whether the officer's interpretation of "furtive behaviour" was appropriate, noting that the young person was already known to police and linked to intelligence, which could explain their reluctance to engage.

CH: Clarified that the stop was based on a member of the public directing officers to an alleged altercation, combined with local and individual intelligence, and not solely on perceived "furtive behaviour." Noting the grounds came from multiple factors including the report, observed circumstances, and intelligence, rather than behaviour alone.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 3: Stop and Search - 371716/270326/213245

Grounds for stop/search:

SEE: At 2120hours on 27th March 2026 I have seen two Romanian males at the end of "Bag Alley" on Upper Brook Street. They appeared to be loitering together. I have engaged with one of the males who identified that they had no real purpose for being in the area. KNOW: I have conducted a police check via the airwaves and I was informed that xxx had intelligence for discreetly exchanging an item to and unknown passerby whilst outside UPPER BROOK STREET Sainsbury's. I am aware there is recent and relevant intelligence for a drug line operating close by to where the males were encountered. SUSPECT: Due to the SEE and KNOW elements, I suspected xxx could have been in this area to supply drugs in Ipswich

ISCRE Comments:

What were the suspicious circumstances why this person was initially stopped?
How recent was the intelligence (date) referring to a drug line operating in the area?

Are all persons that attend that area going to be stopped, why was this person stopped, what was the suspicious behaviour for them to be stopped and searched?

Nothing found, nfa.

We will review this BWV to get a better understanding of this stop/search.

Discussion:

CH: Explained that briefing slides identify areas of concern but do not provide authority for stop and search, which must be based on reasonable grounds. Stating the officer formed grounds from observations and intelligence in a known hotspot area.

EC: Outlined plans to introduce officer guidance cards covering key stop and search requirements, alongside QR codes for public feedback and follow-up. The initiative aims to improve consistency, transparency, and community confidence.

PM: Expressed concern about the officer's communication style, noting that the interaction appeared negative from the outset and was less cordial than expected. Questions regarding the individual's immigration status and earnings were viewed as potentially irrelevant to the purpose of the encounter.

SL: Raised concerns about the use of a friend as a translator rather than an approved language service and felt some officer comments and language were unprofessional.

FJ: Questioned whether the comments and behaviour observed on the body-worn video were acceptable standards for officers and asked what action, if any, had been taken in response to those concerns.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 3: Stop and Search - 371716/270326/213245

Discussion:

CH: Acknowledged concerns about the interaction and confirmed that officers receive recorded feedback following scrutiny reviews, with repeat issues monitored and escalated where necessary.

PM: Requested clarification on whether the age of the intelligence used to support the search was still considered relevant

CH: Stated that intelligence from November alone would not have justified the search and emphasised that the strength of intelligence, rather than its age, is the key factor in establishing reasonable suspicion.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 4: Taser - SC-11012026-18

Rason for Taser Use:

Report of a male in a possession of a machete. Male was located hiding in bushes in the dark. Taser was drawn / red dotted and commands given to comply as directed. Male was belived to be in poession of a weapon. Male ultimately complited and was searched with nothing found.

ISCRE Comments:

Suspect said to be in bushes. Was there verbal de-escalation and warnings before Taser was drawn and red dotted?

We will review the BWV to gain a better understanding of the UOF.

Discussion:

BWV was reviwed by ISCRE

EC: Summarised a late-night nightclub incident where a male was reported to have shown a large knife and was tracked via CCTV to officers. Taser units quickly contained the compliant suspect and a search was carried out, which was considered fully justified and well-handled based on the intelligence and circumstances.

PM: Shared that the interaction was assessed as positive and proportionate, noting there was clear evidence linking the individual to the reported knife. Questioning the "impact factors" such as prior martial arts knowledge, stating it was unclear how this was relevant as it did not appear in the interaction or affect the grounds for the stop.

CH: Clarified that "prior knowledge" referred to intelligence that the suspect was armed and tracked via CCTV, not martial arts. Noting the wording was misleading due to system limitations and said recording processes are being improved for clarity.

FJ: Questioned what post-incident action had been taken in relation to the nightclub, including whether licensing action was considered following the reported knife incident and CCTV tracking of the suspect.

CH: Stated that incidents linked to licensed premises trigger a licensing review by the licensing team, with venues risk-assessed on a red/amber/green basis to guide scrutiny.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 5: Use of Force - 37BC/3721/25

Rason for use of force:

Male ran from officers for an unknown reason and was chased and cornered. He put his hands in his pockets as he approached me and I did not know if he was accessing a weapon as he was trapped and couldn't run away He then ran off and when he gave up I premtively sprayed him as he has warning markers for assaulting officers and as he could not outrun me he may decide that the only way to escape me is physical violence towards me

ISCRE Comments:

We question this use of force when the suspect seemingly gives up? How old were those warning markers? Can we please review BWV to get a better understanding of the UOF.
Review BWV

Discussion:

CH: Stated the male fled, discarded an item, and was detained after pursuit, with PAVA use justified due to risk and evasion. He added drugs were recovered, the suspect was wanted for domestic abuse offences, and wider review found appropriate use of powers with no disproportionality concerns and good use of force and aftercare.

PM: Queried whether the officers could have arrested the individual first for outstanding matters before conducting the search, rather than searching prior to arrest, and asked why that sequence was not followed given the circumstances.

CH: Clarified the male was arrested at the first opportunity after PAVA and handcuffs were used while he was still resisting. Stating the subsequent search was post-arrest and conducted for officer safety and evidence recovery, not a separate stop and search.

PM: Shared the use of force was well justified and showed a clear progression of events, and suggested positive feedback for how the incident was handled.

FJ: Questioned how long intelligence markers remain relevant, querying whether they are retained for a set period or can remain in place for years once recorded.

CH: Explained that markers vary depending on type and are subject to data protection and retention rules, with older warnings still visible but clearly date-stamped so officers can assess relevance. some markers, such as those for serious offences, remain longer than others, and that relevance decreases with age.

CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Case 6: Use of Force - SC-08122025-174

Rason for use of force:

Force used to prevent escape due to not knowing any details and to enable arrest and search.

ISCRE Comments:

Is it fair to use force due to not knowing any details?

Was the suspect compliant?

Could the search and arrest have taken place without the UOF?

Can we review the BWV to gain a better understanding of the UOF.

Discussion:

EC: Explained officers attended a DVLA incident where a male had attempted to obtain a licence using false details and was about to leave when they arrived. Handcuffs were used to prevent escape while enquiries were made, and he was later arrested for fraud and taken into custody.

PM: Questioned whether the officer properly articulated the rationale for using force, noting that while concern about escape may justify handcuffing, "not knowing details" alone is not a sufficient justification.

EC: Mentioned they spoke to a new officer who requested feedback, noting the rationale was clearer in discussion than in the written form, which did not fully capture the circumstances or reasoning for the use of force.

PM: Emphasised the importance of accurately recording rationale at the time, noting inconsistencies between forms and later explanations can undermine trust and affect complaints or court proceedings.

CH: Agreed on the importance of accurate first-time documentation and said this is consistently reinforced. He added that feedback helps officers understand expectations and confirmed panel feedback would be passed on.

AOB:

PM: Noted the meeting planned for July and September will be a face-to-face meetings.

SL: Clarified that the July meeting will take place at the ISCRE Hub, with the Bury St Edmunds face-to-face meeting scheduled for September.

Next Meeting:

July 29th - At the ISCRE Hub