

# Stop & Search, Use of Force and Continuous Improvement Panel – External

Wednesday, 24<sup>th</sup> January 2024 at 6.00pm



## MINUTES

### IN ATTENDANCE

A/ACC Karen Edwards (KE)  
Chief Supt Chris Hardy (CH)  
Inspector Jon Campbell-Smith (JCS)  
A/Insp Dave Johnson (DJ)  
Connor Eastwood (CE)  
Dean Roscoe (DR)  
Clinton Smith (CS)  
Rob Gomery (RG)  
Paul Hudson PH)  
Marcus Naylor (MN)  
Denise Hanson (UCLan)(DH)  
Keith Kirby (KK)  
Don Green (DG)  
Amanda Woolridge (AW)  
Reece Richards (RR)  
Paul Entwistle (PE)  
Debbie Storr (DS)  
Gill Strachan (GS)  
Stephen Donnell (SD)  
George Stewart-Moss (GSM)  
Zee Amin (ZA)  
Rozila Kana (RK)  
Mark Hindle (MH)  
Glenn Ireland (GI)  
Carol Benton (CB) – OPCC

### APOLOGIES

Chris Cottam (Chair)  
Halima Karbhari  
Louise West  
Nichola Grimshaw

CH welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially new members, and thanked everyone for volunteering their time to sit on this panel.

### DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The Panel nominated CH to chair the meeting in the absence of Chris Cottam (Chair). He reminded members of the Panel to consider whether they may have to disclose to the meeting knowing any individuals or officers in relation to any matters under consideration on the Agenda. If it became apparent they knew any persons or properties during the discussions, they should make the Chair aware and step out of the meeting for that item.

### **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The Minutes of the last meeting having been previously agreed were accepted as a true record

### **ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 1) **ACTION:** At the last meeting it was noted that the video highlighting the role of the independent chair of this panel had not been completed and CH undertook to progress the matter.

This has not yet been completed.

Action ongoing.

- 2) **ACTION:** At a previous meeting members had been informed that some forces have a stop and search ride-a-long scheme but that is not the way that Lancs wish to go, as officers may feel compelled to do a stop search. CH prefers to operate the ride-a-long scheme in its widest terms linked to policing operations where it is believed a stop search will take place. A draft Policy and Risk Assessment have been prepared and, once approved and dates are known, the intention would be to invite participation of panel members through CB.

Action ongoing.

- 3) **ACTION:** CH to compile a list of additional data sets through Pronto.

The way the force records stop and search data is changing and different data reports set up. An agreed set of metrics had been produced and the intention is to produce the report in time for these panel meetings.

Action ongoing.

- 4) **ACTION:** JCS to arrange for Zahid Dudhia, PSD, to attend a future meeting to give a more detailed complaints data update.

Action ongoing.

### **UPDATE IN RELATION TO STOP & SEARCH DATA**

This links to the actions from previous meetings above.

A verbal update was given regarding changes being made but no data was presented to members.

## **REVIEW OF STOP SEARCH AND ASSOCIATED BWV**

The Panel considered **5 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 reviewed **Stop and Search Incident 1** with the following outcomes:

- **What went well**
  - The officer said he was from Fleetwood.
  - The majority of Gowisely was covered, but not all of it.
  - The officers demeanour was good, he asked if the subject had been searched before.
  - The stop had a positive outcome (community resolution and no detention).
  - The officer informed the subject when they were no longer detained and were free to go.
  - The subject remained with the officer to provide their details after being told he could go.
- **What did not go well**
  - The officer was not specific about what he was searching for and could have been clearer.
  - Whilst agreeing the need for officers to try and engage and build relationships there was mixed feelings about his use of the term 'mate', with members having split opinions. It was however noted that the male stopped didn't make any comment about it.
  - The officer didn't ask the subject if they had any more drugs on them.
  - The search wasn't deemed effective as the officer didn't appear to search right down the leg to the socks.
  - The officer informed the subject that he was 'good to go' but then started to ask for their personal details.
  - Some members were concerned that the young man stopped had no one supporting him.
- **Additional Information:**

It was noted that it was important for officers to effectively judge the situations they are in and to use suitable and appropriate language. Through this panel the suitability of language used, and seen, can be fed back into training.

CH informed new members that officers had no right to delay persons and there was no right for the subject to provide their personal details to officers.

CH advised that the internal scrutiny panel had commented that the officer was stood with his back to a busy road and could have been pushed back into it, they must consider self-preservation during all such interactions.

CH advised that, for transparency, officers could ask individuals who they wanted to be searched by or how they preferred to be addressed etc.

**ACTION:** CH to produce and circulate, through CB, an aide memoire explaining what can be done.

The Panel reviewed **S&S Incident 2** with the following outcomes:

- **What went well**
  - The panel felt this case was a good example of the difficult job the police do, due to the changing attitudes. Officers need situational awareness.
  - The search was felt to be better but it was acknowledged they were searching for weapons so would be more thorough, and they still didn't go all the way down the leg or pat it down.

- **What did not go well**
- Members felt the officer was not very professional.
- Members thought the officer could have potentially escalated the situation by his manner, pointing etc.
- The officer chastised the subject for swearing and then swore himself.
- The officer didn't talk to the subject whilst searching him, no attempt made to build rapport.
- The form reflected that BWV was not used, which is incorrect.
- The panel were unaware what had happened before as the subject was already cuffed at the start of the video.
- The paperwork stated there were no other officers present but the BWV showed this to be incorrect.

Action: JCS to take this back to Learning and Development to ensure officers are being properly advised to record all officers on the paper work.

- **Additional information:**
- CH advised the internal scrutiny panel felt there was some learning to come from this case. Parts of Gowisely were covered but it was quick and it was felt the back story had influenced the search. The officer threatened to lock the subject up for Breach of the Peace which would have been unlawful as he was age 15.

The Panel reviewed **S&S Incident 3** with the following outcomes:

- **What went well**
- The officer was polite and kept talking. Members liked their demeanour and felt they had good interpersonal skills (command and control not as good).
- **What did not go well**
- The camera was activated late.
- It was noted the female officer did the search despite there being a male officer present (JCS advised she might be a tutor showing a probationer what to do).
- Members queried how thorough the waistband search was. The officer did not wear gloves and lost control of the search by letting the subject put his hands in his pockets even though there was a weapons marker.
- **Additional information**
- CH advised the internal panel found the same but also didn't like how the officer moved the subject into the road, they felt on the pavement by the wall might have been safer.

The Panel reviewed **S&S Incident 4** with the following outcomes:

- **What went well**
- The officer controlled the situation well when the female became agitated. He had a nice mix of firmness and politeness.
- The officer searched her well, but stopped short of the groin area so a female search officer would have been preferable.
- **What did not go well**
- The officer did not wear gloves.

- Members felt the female could have been moved away from the male she was with. They questioned whether she might have passed anything to him, and he wasn't searched.
- A panel member felt she put her hands where they couldn't be seen.
- **Additional Information:**  
A member asked if the panel could have sight of operational data, for example to show how many cameras were being used previously and how many are being used now? They felt it was important that the data showed the volume pattern.

**ACTION:** CH to consider how he can make the data set show the operational context.

## **REVIEW OF USE OF FORCE**

As there were several new panel members there had been a lot of questions and more dialogue/explanations than usual.

As a result the Panel agreed to consider just one Use of Force Case of the 5 available chosen by an algorithm. They selected **Use of Force Incident 3** and were shown an incident log, Use of Force form(s) and BWV.

The Chair again reminded members of the Panel to consider whether they may have to disclose to the meeting knowing any individuals or officers in relation to any matters under consideration on the Agenda. If it became apparent they knew any persons or properties during the discussions, they should make the Chair aware and step out of the meeting for that item.

The Panel reviewed **UoF Incident 3** with the following outcomes:

- **What went well**
  - The panel did not identify anything that went well.
- **What did not go well**
  - Members felt they needed to have seen what happened before the video commenced.
  - They questioned who was controlling who and felt the officer could have quietened the female and taken control of the situation more effectively.
  - Members questioned the role that the door staff appeared to play and why they were shaking hands with the officers on camera, how that might look to members of the public.
  - The camera coverage could have been better.
  - The officer grabbed the male by the arm twice and members asked if that was lawful. CH advised it was under common law to prevent a breach of the peace.

## **SECTION 60 AUTHORITIES SINCE THE LAST MEETING**

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Post meeting update –

Panel members are reminded that Section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 allows a senior police officer to authorise constables to stop and search persons in a specific area, either where a serious public order problem is likely to arise or has taken place, or for offensive weapons or dangerous instruments.

One Section 60 had been authorised in the last quarter, in Blackburn. This will be fed back to panel at the next meeting and members given the opportunity to review, together with the Section 60 authorised in Claremont the previous quarter which was also not reviewed due to lack of time.

#### **UPDATE ON RIDE-A-LONG**

This item had been covered earlier in the meeting.

#### **COMPLAINTS DATA AND CONCLUSION**

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Post meeting update – This will be discussed at the next meeting.

Due to time constraints it was discussed whether panel members would be happy for a longer meeting in future. To be discussed in full at the next meeting.

Action: JCS to arrange for Zahid Dudhia to attend and give a more detailed complaints update.

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business was noted.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, 17<sup>th</sup> April 2024

Mrs Angela Harrison  
**Chief Executive**