**Custody Detention Scrutiny Panel – External**

**Wednesday, 17th April 2024**

**MINUTES**

I**N ATTENDANCE**

Brian Walker (BW) - Chair

Rachel Culverwell (RC)

Paul Siddall (PS)

Reece Richards (RR)

Victoria Blakeman (VB)

Mark Hindle (MH)

Paul Barlow (PB)

Glenn Ireland (GI)

Supt Hassan Khan (HK) – Lancashire Constabulary – Via Teams

Chief Inspector Kev Evans (KE) – Lancashire Constabulary

Insp Dave Johnson (DJ) – Lancashire Constabulary

Sophie Temple (ST) – Lancashire Constabulary

Carol Benton (CB) – OPCC

**APOLOGIES**

Rozila Kana (RK)– Lancashire Constabulary

Supt Hassan Khan welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked everyone for volunteering their time to sit on this panel. The setting up of the external Scrutiny Panel is a positive step forward and in line with HMICFRS recommendations. He advised members that there was also an internal Custody Scrutiny Panel within the Constabulary and both panels will examine the same data records selected at random to determine whether they feel the decisions made were necessary and justifiable, providing feedback if not. The focus is on the detainees, their welfare and making it the best experience we can for them. Custody staff must take individual needs into account, whilst gathering the evidence they need.

All members introduced themselves.

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Panel members were reminded 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.

**INDUCTION**

Chief Insp Evans and Insp Johnson delivered the induction for new members.

**Action 1 :** a)Custody Data to be a standing item on future agenda's.

 b) Members to let CB know of any particular data sets they would like to see.

**Action 2**: KE/DJ to bring an anti-rip suit to the next meeting.

**Action 3:** CB to circulate the power-point slides used for the induction.

**REVIEW OF REMANDED CHILDREN CASES**

The Panel reviewed **Remanded Children Case 1** after being shown the incident log, with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
* Members felt it was a good write up/summary
* There was a clear evidence base to justify remanding
* Although the Local Authority had not been contacted, members agreed it would have been impractical to do so during the night
* **Additional Information**:

A discussion took place regarding the provision of local authority beds and RC questioned whether the calls to local authorities could be made earlier by the arresting officer perhaps before charges are made to avoid losing time.

**REVIEW OF USE OF FORCE CASES**

The Panel reviewed Use of Force **Use of Force Case 1** after being shown the incident log, with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
* Members felt it was a good write up.
* **What did not go well**
* There was no mention of what had led up to the incident.
* There was no mention of de-escalation tactics (officer didn’t say they would use force if the detainee failed to comply).
* The date the warning marker was last updated was omitted.
* The log referred to self-harm shorts, not anti-rip suits.

**Action 4:** KE/DJ to advise officers to include de-escalation tactics and to show the booking in process.

**Action 5:** KE to bring CCTV and/or BWV footage to future meetings where available.

**Action 6**: KE to feed back to officers the importance of the language used and advise they must refer to

 anti-rip suits and not self-harm shorts.

**Additional information:**

* It was noted that, as the officer did not use an anti-rip suit, such a lengthy write up was not necessary.
* A member asked whether the incident log should mention if the detainee is non-English or English isn’t their first language?

**Action 7:** DJ to check whether the detainees in the sample cases reviewed are English.

**REVIEW OF STRIP SEACH CASES**

The Panel reviewed **Strip Search Case 1** after being shown the incident log, with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
* There was a clear reason for authorising a strip search.
* The log stated it took place in a non-camera cell.
* **What did not go well**
* It didn’t say whether or not force was used.
* It needed more explanation of where the drugs were located and how they were removed.

**REVIEW OF STRIP SEARCH / ANTI-RIP SUIT CASES**

The Panel reviewed **Strip Search / Anti-Rip Suit Case 1** after being shown the incident log, with the following outcomes:

* **What went well**
* The log refers to the recency of the detainee's previous issues so the relevance of the markers in terms of time-frames was clear.
* Different options were identified.
* There was a good rationale as to why certain options had been discounted.
* **What did not go well**
* There was no review undertaken.
* The log was contradictory as it referred initially to high risk and then to medium risk, this might have been a copy and paste issue, the officer just hadn’t individualised it?

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business was noted.

Members agreed a further meeting should be arranged to review the residual selected cases not covered in the meeting due to the induction.

**Action 8**: CB to arrange a further meeting to be held as soon as practicable.

**NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, 7th August 2024

Mrs Angela Harrison

**Chief Executive**