



Stop and Search Scrutiny panel

Location: Virtual Via Teams

Date and Time: 20.03.2025

In Attendance: D.HALL, N.COX, C.JONES, M.SHAW, D.EARNSHAW, G.HANCOCK, S.JONES, S.SHAIKH, P.SAWYERS, D.THOMAS (visiting officer)

Apologises: P.SINGH

	Item Discussed	Actions
1.	<p>Welcome and introduction</p> <p>Update on any actions taken from last meeting will take place before Stop and Search/Use of Force is discussed (if any)</p> <p>Welcome to any new members (if any)</p> <p>Mics must be muted unless speaking and cameras off to prevent 'glitching'.</p> <p>Meeting is scheduled for 2 hours with no break.</p> <p>Reminder to members of confidentiality and please ensure that no one in your household/office is able to see or hear the videos shown.</p> <p>There may be bad language and violence, please take time out if needed.</p> <p>The focus of our attention needs to be on the actions of the officers, rather than analysing the person being stopped.</p> <p>This is not a police bashing forum. Keep feedback constructive whether positive or negative.</p> <p>Time and support is much appreciated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure that G.O.W.I.S.E.L.Y is explained when we have new members. This has been suggested by long standing panel members. This is now a permanent slide on the S&S Update power point.• Data is sent to panel members before the meeting and no questions were sent through.
2.	UPDATE on Stop and Search Data	No comments made by panel here.
3.	Dip sample of Stop and Search	Video Numbered 3



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Began with officer saying I don't care. Not great at all.• Officer was speaking so quickly we didn't catch the reason for detainment.• Its important that anyone being detained/arrested can understand and comprehend what is being said.• Officer said 'clear off' to some of the bystanders.• The tone of the officers is pretty derogatory and I can't help but think it's because they're drug users. Dismissal of the female being honest about having injected drugs. This lacked a level of dignity.• The female officer not even looking at the other female when she's asking them to be careful with wallet because of sentimental contents was not good. <p>Video Numbered 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Handcuffing with no communication and seemed very unnecessary.• The handcuffs seemed to go from zero to 1000. The man was quite chilled and non-confrontational.• I think the officer seeking to find out why the man was hiding the spliff was a bit of a nonsense conversation to be honest. I like that the officer was trying to engage, but it may of come across as patronising.• Officer Sultan saying hello to people as he walked down the street prior to the engagement here was a positive and suggests an attempt to build community relations.• Claire provided some context regarding the reasons for handcuffing and the high level of crime in the area. <p>Video Numbered 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It may well have been in the preceding context but the seizing of the car, was their search linked to the balloon canisters or was there
--	--



		<p>an additional issue linked to the search.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No cuffing which was interesting and panel have asked for feedback on this out of curiosity.• The officer zipped back the persons pocket with his money in which was a positive.• Is it an individual decision for officers when they are searching outer garments to explain what they're doing as they go through it? Or is there a procedural expectation from the force.• The officers approach was very calm, respectful and clear. His voice was the only voice and communication was consistent.
4.	Update on Use of Force data & Dip sample of Use of Force records	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• RE the data is any work being done to investigate why there's been an increase in the figures with regards to Black People. <p>DIP SAMPLES Video Numbered 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Non-compliant cuffing, primary control and parva.• Did the officer discharge the parva spray with no warning? And is she supposed to do that?• Female officer made several comments referring to the person and saying '....there's something wrong with him.....' The panel didn't like that.• Panel queried if caution should be given before the search starts? The member of the public could say they were distracted by the search and didn't hear/understand the caution.• Panel felt that the communication was poor (particularly in comparison to other videos viewed).• Officers were talking about the member of public as if he wasn't there.• The member of public complained about his right eye (Parva was used) and the female officer said she would get him water. He was removed from the bus into the path of other officers



	<p>and no water was given. Care for him could have happened during the search.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Panel commented on multiple occasions about the poor communication and not speaking directly to the member of public.• The communication between the officers was lacking in dignity and respect.• Panel questioned if the officer was qualified to diagnose a mental health condition.• The female officer later said that she removed her taser but the space became too close so she didn't use it (this was not seen in the footage viewed by the panel). <p>Video Numbered 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Language is very aggressive from the start of the video.• Sounds super confusing with lots of voices talking over each other/shouting and isn't clear at times.• Comment made that it appeared that something was being hidden for 3 minutes.• This is quite antagonistic – why engage with him in that way when it's clear he's agitated (officers were called to a disturbance and the member of public was very agitated on officers arrival).• This is chaotic (this comment was made multiple times).• Why is the male officer getting into a back and forth with the member of public? It sounded much more like an ego battle than a police officer attempting to de-escalate.• Was the search announced? I feel like I missed it. The one officer trying to get the member of public's details and the search going on at the same time, the communication between the officers was haphazard.• Why are so many different conversations taking place at
--	--



	<p>one time? And was he cautioned?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very confusing. Too many people talking at once. Several people doing things all at the same time. The officer supplying the BWC footage keeps moving away from what's going on.• If there was such a struggle with cuffing why did an officer walk away from the situation to speak to the security guards on site? This could have been done after.• Difficult to see the Use of Force properly as we had the perspective of the officer who didn't use the force – is it typical for an officer who hasn't done the force to complete the record?• The member of public was attempting to speak to the dual heritage office from when he was sat on the ground. The officer was combative from the outset. Whilst he may have built a rapport later, this wasn't great in terms of his initial interaction.• If the communication was good from the start, then would you need to get so physical because the video starts from exiting the venue but no bodycam inside when the incident started. <p>Video Numbered 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• You can see there is language barrier and no caution.• Should the taser being drawn be announced rather than just drawing it and pointing it?• Not allowing someone to put trousers on him wasn't best practice. Whilst he had on shorts he was handcuffed and 2 officers were with him. Would any harm have occurred?• He put down the weapon once he saw the taser that does not mean he understands the language.• Was his compliance about the fear of the taser more than language understanding.
--	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• When the individual spoke it was in a different language and did the officers understand him?• Panel discussed at length how officers engage with members of the public who don't speak English. With regards to this particular case, the member of public had a weapon and that needed to be addressed first before checking out his level of understanding.• Reminder was given to the panel that we don't always have to agree.• Panel also felt that we need to see the U of F record as part of the scrutiny.
5.	Action notes from discussions for update at next panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Last meeting of the year to be in person.• Query around the UoF disproportionality figures around black people.
6.	Date and location of next panel	15.5.2025 on Teams