

## Stop and Search Scrutiny panel

**Location:** Gavin Charlton Room, Coventry

**Date and Time:** 02 October 2023

**In Attendance:** [Please refer to the register].

**Apologies:** N/K

	Item Discussed	Actions
1.	Welcome and introduction Minutes of the last meeting, update on any actions taken from last meeting	
2.	UPDATE on stop and search data from PS 95 Rob Mackay	Data presentation and format – Needs to be displayed in a more easily read and visible format. The projector screen is poor quality and information presented is illegible.
3.	Dip sample of stop and search  You can list the Search no, date, time, but you cannot identify the officers by name or collar number or person being searched by name  Example:  SSBE-YK-46391679 PC S and subject W. 22/10/22 at 1702hrs	As per forms completed (3 Use of Force Forms; and 3 Stop and Search Forms)  The display of the figures in the presentation were difficult to see by the attendees – projector issues.  For further points please refer to the actual forms.
4.	Dip sample of Use of Force records  You can list the LOG no, date, time, but you cannot identify the officers by name or column number or person being searched by name  Example:  Log 3200/30/6/22 PC S. Subject C	The display of the figures in the presentation were difficult to see by the attendees – projector issues.  For further points please refer to the actual forms.



5.	Action noted from discussions for update at next panel	Suitability of the Use of Force Forms and Stop and Search Forms.
6.	Any notes, questions, requests for the next Bi annual Stop and Search commission	The information presented on the projector is blurred, unclear and not presenting all the information.  Concerns raised about the Sikh community being targeted by the Indian Government.
7.	Date and location of next panel	08 Jan 2024 at Gavin Charlton Suite..

Stop and search Ref Number:	Record 1 149789059	Record 2 150032891	Record 3 147283475
Points to consider on the Record			
Power - Does the stated Power match the object of search on the E-SEARCH record and Did the rationale reflect this within the ground's information section?	Yes – s.1 PACE Offensive Weapon, person and vehicle search	s.1 PACE for offensive weapon, namely a knife	s.1 PACE for stolen items, suspicion the vehicle is stolen
Do you feel the grounds were sufficiently covered in the free text?	Yes - An imitation firearm in the drivers side door compartment.	Yes	No.
Is the panel content with the standard of the record, its detail and agree with supervisor signoff?	Yes	Yes	No – the verbal communication and the text in the form do not match.
Points to consider in BWV			
Did the detail on the record match that seen on BWV, i.e., age, race ethnicity, same sex officers, grounds?	Yes	Yes	yes



Did the officer explain the grounds clearly to the detainee? Considering - Modifying the language to meet the needs i.e., Young person, Mental Health?	Yes	Yes	No – “blah blah blah” is not sufficient explanation.
Do the panel feel the detainee has fully understand the grounds explained to them?	Yes	Yes	Unlikely, as the officer insufficiently explained their powers.
Was Go Wisely completed including Entitlement to a record, ref no. given? QR code shown?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Handcuffing - if used do you feel were required?		Yes and it was fair.	
Can you choose a word to describe the interaction in relation to each below:	Behaviour/demeanour/Body language: Good	Good	Poor
	Tone of the officer: excellent	Very good	Tone was fair, but communication and professionalism was poor
	Overall treatment of detainee: very good	The camera should have been turned on earlier to record when the interaction started.	Poor verbal communication.
<b>Any other points</b>	The search is for stolen or prohibited articles, but what if the paper documents in the car were were records of imitation firearms purchased/	As above.	The search was unclear and its extent could not be ascertained with certainty on the camera. The view was obscured, and the reason for detained the person was unclear.



	supplied? Is the search reasonable and proportionate where documents are also being reviewed? Also, should the search have been conducted under a more appropriate firearms act?		
--	--	--	--

Use of Force # no	Record 1 1479316 (PCSO)	Record 2 1393123	Record 3 Form ID:1364727	Record 4 1428364
Has the inspector told you the type of Use of Force you are scrutinising? i.e. Taser, Non-compliant handcuffing?	Yes, restraint.	Taser drawn is the use of force.	No video footage is available. Officer failed to select the 'save' option. This footage is now lost. The panel asks why and how this could happen?	Starts off as a stop and search, and then develops into a use of force. The use of force is the officer seeking to restrain the person running away. The assailant pushes the officers hand away.
Do you feel the Use of force was necessary and fair?	Person seen urinating in public, and officers want to speak with the person. Possible	The officer swearing to the assailant. The officer kept saying, "don't make me chase you", may have encouraged the person to run	N/A	To understand why use of force was necessary, requires the panel to



	criminal damage.	away. Perhaps the officer should have been closer to the person when arresting.		understand why he ran away. The possibility that the assailant may have been wanted.
Do you feel the Use of force was proportionate to the incident and environment?		The foul language used by the officer was not appropriate.	N/A	Its not clear that the assailant hit the officer, or whether he sought to escape. The use of force is unclear.
Do you feel the correct level of Force was used?		Is it appropriate to use the taser if the person is running away (in these circumstances)?	N/A	It is unclear
Do you feel the appropriate warning or clear communication was given before Force used?	The women was pinned down to the pavement, with her face down on the pavement. The officers were patient, but the person was not being violent.	Yes	N/A	
<b>Was there a chance to de-escalate? If so, do you feel it was taken?</b>	There didn't seem to be sufficient aftercare for the person	The officer repeatedly said the assailant, don't make me chase you. This may	N/A	No chance to de-escalate – person ran away.



	detained. She said she was pregnant, and also explained she had a weak bladder. Aftercare was not present in the footage seen.	have been counterproductive.		
Was after care offered? If so, was it proportionate and delivered timely and effectively?	The panel felt it was not fair for the women to be held down on the pavement.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Do you feel the correct level of dignity/respect/empathy was shown?	No. The panel were concerned by the pinning of the persons head to the floor. The detained person said she was pregnant.	N/A	N/A	Yes.
Can you choose 3 words to summarise the Use of Force?	Face to the pavement. Is this fair force?	Is it fair to taser a person running away?	N/A	Pushing hands away – Is this assault toward an officer?
Any other thoughts	Wrong log number attached to the form.	-	N/A	The panel could not see clear evidence of assault



west midlands  
police and crime  
commissioner

				upon the officer.
--	--	--	--	----------------------