

# SUFFOLK POLICE POWERS PUBLIC SCRUTINY (SPPPS) MINUTES

**Chair - Phaniel Mutumburi**

**Minute Taker - Sharon Lee**

**Date: 31st July 2024**

**16:00 - 18:00**

**Location: ISCRE**

**Welcome** - All Welcomed by the Chair

**Introductions** - All members introduced themselves

**Minutes from previous meeting** - Minutes signed off

**SPPPS** - PM provided an update regarding the change from SSRG to SPPPS to the group.

## **Attendance: 26**

Phaniel Mutumburi  
Sharon Lee  
Kelly Holmes  
Stacey Runciman  
Tim Passmore  
Lucie Green  
Claire McDonald  
Franstine Jones  
Daisy Weeks  
Savi TB  
Hamil Clarke  
John Lambert  
Kate Fitzsimons  
Pc Kim Butler  
Ben Throssell  
Carmel (Franstine Guest)  
Lorna Gordon  
Lauren Harris  
Adria Pitcock  
Lenny Paul  
Julie Baker  
Julie Baker's student  
Audrey Ludwig  
Daniel Smith  
James Bolton  
Shawn Reynolds

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 1:

375114/120424/220142

## ISCRE Comments:

The grounds for this search does not clarify why this person was stopped and searched. What CCTV? Was the suspect always in sight? Where was the alleged stolen necklace? How do we know the police approached the person of suspicion with no description noted? Nothing was found, no further action. Can we please have more details and clear grounds for this stop/search.

## Grounds:

CCTV showing male picking up alleged stolen necklace at placing it in his pocket then making off

## Discussion:

### **BWV not available to view**

Officer response:

I have had a look and it appears to be in relation to a stolen necklace that I witnessed a male pick up and place into his pocket on CCTV during a public order matter-

The panel were disappointed there was no BWV available for ISCRE to review.

The officers response was unsatisfactory and has still not answered the questions raised. This has been requested to taken away as an action.

## Actions:

A full and thorough response to be provided answering the questions raised..

It was identified at panel the response does not provide enough detail and feedback should go to going to the officer and supervisor for signing it off.

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 2:

370868/270424/212913

## ISCRE Comments:

Request to review BWV.

There is no clarity around this stop & search, and it is difficult to understand who and why this person was stopped. Where did the information come from that this person had a knife. There are no details showing clearly the grounds for this search. Perhaps viewing the BWV will better assist us.

## Grounds:

### SEE:

Called to inc SC-27042024-278 where the informant had stated that the suspect had a knife. No other calls.

Subjects at the scene all giving different accounts

### KNOW:

Initially no information known about the subject; given the risk around weapons an early intervention was required  
Informant asked to clearly point out who he believed had a knife.

### SUSPECT:

The incident was reasonably chaotic with no parties sharing a common language inf identified the male and again stated that there was suspicion of a knife  
Search item was for a knife

## Discussion:

### BWV not available to view

#### Officer Response:

The informant stated that the subject of my search had a knife on him, this was again stated by the informant at the scene. I have conducted the search based on the CAD information and the informant re-iterating this at the scene.

JC: Identified at the scrutiny meeting whereby I referred to the CAD (incident itself) and could glean far more detail in terms of a local disagreement and detail that if it had been included on the SS form would have been acceptable. Feedback will also go back to the officer.

## Actions:

JC: Response does not give enough detail, i.e disagreement on swapping cars on Facebook.  
Further feedback regarding the form and questions asked and not yet answered.

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 3:

370509/050524/012953

## ISCRE Comments:

We would like to have seen more information relating to these grounds. Was it a lit area in the club where MOP made their observations? What occurred during the time of the observation and police attending, did the MOP always have site on the suspect during that time? What was the presentation of the suspect when police arrived, under the influence of alcohol/drugs? Was there any intelligence on the suspect? Was a drug swipe taken/necessary? Nothing was found, NFA, can we please have some more details.

## Grounds:

### SEEN:

Member of public stated they had seen subject secret a small bag of powder in his underwear whilst in The Club Ipswich.

### KNOWN:

Subject was identified in person by the member of public

### SUBJECT:

This gave me reasonable grounds to suspect subject was in possession of controlled drugs.

## Discussion:

### BWV not available to view

#### Officers Response:

Was it a lit area in the club where MOP made their observations? MOP was a member of security staff at the establishment and observation was made in the entranceway, which is artificially lit. What occurred during the time of the observation and police attending, did the MOP always have site on the suspect during that time? I was standing outside, opposite the establishment on public order duties. Security staff approached me from the entrance and pointed out subject who had exited the club and was walking away. MOP had his back to the subject when talking to me so would not have had sight of him the during this time. What was the presentation of the suspect when police arrived, under the influence of alcohol/drugs? Subject was happy to engage with me and understood the grounds. Subject was under the influence of alcohol. Was there any intelligence on the suspect? I do not recall checking intel on the subject. Was a drug swipe taken/necessary? I am not qualified to perform a drug swipe and do not know what power I could have used to require one under these circumstances. In addition, calling for a RAPT officer to carry out this test would have caused undue delay to the subject. Nothing was found, NFA, can we please have some more details. No drugs were found so no further action taken. Subject continued about his business.

Much better response but more detail initially would have been more helpful.

## Actions:

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 4:

AFI - 37/2157/24

## ISCRE Comments:

We are trying to understand the rationale for the use of taser at the early stage it was drawn. We also see that the highest stage was 'drawn', however we have read elsewhere that the level was a red dot, could you please clarify this and could we please view the BWV to gain a better understanding of this incident and the use of taser.

## Reasons for Use of Force:

- Effect Arrest
- Protect Self

## Discussion:

**BWV not available to view**

Officer Response:

1. **Context and Offender Profile**: - The offender was wanted for an outstanding offence and his recall to prison. - The offender has a history of burglary and assault, drug and alcohol use indicating potential danger. 2. **Environment**: - The incident took place at night in a dimly lit flat. - The confined space of the flat increased the Potential risk. 3. **Officer Safety**: - I was alone inside the property. - The offender was aware of my presence but refused to identify himself or surrender. 4. **Risk Assessment**: - Given the offender's history, there was a reasonable concern for my safety. - The lack of visibility and confined space heightened the risk of a sudden confrontation. 5. **Decision to Use Taser**: - The Taser was used preemptively to mitigate the risk of a sudden attack. - Announcing myself as a Taser officer might have influenced the offender's behaviour, potentially reducing his motivation to evade or resist. 6. **Proportionality and Justification**: - The use of the Taser was a measured response to the perceived threat. - The aim was to ensure the safety of both the officer and the offender by preventing a potentially violent confrontation. The use of force must always be proportional to the threat perceived. Given the situation described: - **Proportionality**: Using a Taser was proportional given the offender's background, refusal to comply, and the potential threat to my safety in a confined, poorly lit environment. - **Necessity**: The Taser was necessary to subdue a non-compliant offender who could pose a danger. - **Justification**: My decision was justified based on the offender's history, the environment, and the need to ensure officer safety.

Whilst this response was provided the officer has already been suspended from Taser duties due to the use of the Taser as a 'torch' and an increased risk of negligent discharge in the circumstances.

## Action:

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 5:

### Use of Force No.62

#### ISCRE Comments:

Request to review BWV.

"When he was taken to the floor he was harshly kicking out with his legs and trying to position himself to get leverage of moving on the floor while we were trying to hold him. He later was taken to hospital as he was appearing unconscious and non-responsive to voice commands"

This recording appears not to have details of what happened between the suspect being taken to the floor and becoming unresponsive. How much time there during the later period. How was he taken to the ground, did his head encounter the ground? What was going on during that time? The recording has moved from taken to the ground to him becoming unresponsive.

#### Reasons for Use of Force:

- Effect Arrest
- Prevent Escape
- Prevent Harm to Subjects
- Protect Other Officers
- Protect Self

#### Discussion:

A two page response was provided by the officer and shared to panel members. Below is the last paragraph of that summary

Officer's Response:

Still presenting as none verbally responsive. I watched him as we transported to custody. He continued to be sat in the same position appearing slumped but at times would readjust his position himself to sit up straighter. When arriving at custody he presented in the same way and the custody nurse aided with him. At this point he did appear fully unconscious and was led on 2 mattresses in the internal parking bay area, until she placed an oral breathing device in his mouth that appeared to be used to open airways to which he reacted by retching and spitting it out. He had no problems breathing but I felt she used this device to see what kind of response he would give. It was at this point that it was recommended he attend hospital. He stayed where he was until ambulance arrived and they provided their same aid and transported to hospital. I stayed with the suspect throughout this period and remained with him at hospital on a constant with my tutor and another officer. The suspect appeared the same and did not change in how he was presenting. While at hospital one of the doctors believed he was in this state due to a substance he had taken prior to the incident with how he was presenting after the medical checks they made.

Julie Baker asked if the police had referred themselves to the IOPC following the incident?

This was unknown and will be an action point.

#### Actions:

Did the police refer themselves to the IOPC?

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 6:

Use of Force No.  
Sc-28042024-39

## ISCRE Comments:

Handcuff Takedown – The male was aggressive, threatening to spit, kicking out and refusing to walk to the psu carrier, actively resisting, not aware of injuries when I assisted apart from a slight bloody nose

How do you believe the DP sustained his bloody nose. Can we review the BWV to better understand this UOF.

## Reasons for Use of Force:

- Effect Arrest
- Prevent Escape
- Prevent Harm to Subject
- Protect Public
- Protect Self

## Discussion:

I do not know how the DP had bloody nose I wasn't dealing with him at that time I was at another area of the illegal rave. I assisted after 2, I was not the arresting officer, I came to assist as the DP was refusing to walk and believed to be under the influence of either drink or drugs, that was when my BWV was turned on. 3, I was not the arresting officer, I believe the DP was given a sect 50 ASB warning given to the DP for his details and I believe the DP refused, the DP was arrested and sect 32 search was conducted and a positive find for drugs was found, this was at a illegal rave i was doing another task while the DP was being arrested and searched. 4, there was alot of Police presence due to an illegal rave, it was a very muddy area of farm land and the DP was refusing to walk and may of be suffering from ABD during to the suspected drink or drug use, the DP was very strong and I had trouble in restraining the DP legs and I was concerned that myself or colleagues could or would have assaulted. 5, I do think not recall the DP saying that and I cannot answer the question. I can review the BWV as I'm on OP gram and have no access to a desk top PC. 6, I believe the DP said he would walk previously but then refused and resisted to walk and had to be carried for his safety. 7, I was not present at the arrest, I assisted in placing the DP into a carrier to be conveyed to a custody after officers asked for assistance, due the DP up and down behaviour possibly due to being under the influence of drink and drugs. Kind regards PC 822 SALAZAR Police Constable.

I spent some time looking at this both in terms of additional BWV footage that captures the original interaction. The subject was detained under ASB legislation and had refused to give details following a UME and many reports of disturbance by local residents. The additional BWV is not great as the camera falls behind the officer fluorescent tabard (PSU officer BWV mounting has its challenges and this can happen). Whilst the additional BWV does not show, for example, the offender getting punched on the nose it does not indicate that this has happened and in general demonstrates the challenge of restraining the subject that led to the original BWV showing the leg restraints being used.

In light of recent events I went further and looked at the custody record in respect of recorded injuries and/or comments from the subject. The custody picture does not show any bruising associated with the nose. The health care professional (HCP) who is independent from the police has recorded wrist injuries only, particularly to the left wrist due to handcuffing (this tends to be standard in respect of handcuffs), nothing recorded in respect of injuries to the face/nose. The subject describes having taken Ketamine, Ecstasy and Cocaine at the event and whilst an assumption it is thought that the bleeding from the nose related more to the inhaling of drugs through the nose as opposed to any physical contact. That is not to say that it didn't occur during the general 'tussle' with officers or indeed when he was taken to the ground to restrain him. I'm as confident as I can be that no officer has deliberately punched the male in the face. There does also not appear to be any complaints to that effect from the subject which I would maybe expect if that was indeed the case. I would also likely expect a video from someone's mobile phone from the scene if this had happened.

## Actions:

## AOB:

Franstine Jones shared a report in respect of strip searches however the panel did not have time to discuss at this meeting.

**Date of next Meeting:** Wednesday September 25th

Meeting concluded at 18:00.