

# SUFFOLK POLICE POWERS PUBLIC SCRUTINY (SPPPS) MINUTES

**Date: 29th January 2025**

**Location: Online via  
Microsoft teams**

**Number in attendance: 17**

**Chair - Phaniel Mutumburi**

**Minute Taker - Travis Dickerson**

**Welcome** - All Welcomed by the Chair

**Introductions** - All members introduced themselves

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

**SPPPS** - Former Actions

The group received updates regarding both forms from the previous meeting. Former actions signed off

## **Attended:**

- Travis Dickerson (TD)
- Andy Pearl (AP)
- Elizabeth Casey (EC)
- Jonathan Chapman (JC)
- Claire Connick (CC)
- Heather-Mae Cutts (HMC)
- David Brown (DB)
- Stella Frangleton (SF)
- Franstine Jones (FJ)
- Amanda Houchen (AH)
- Julie Baker (JB)
- Kelly Holmes (KH)
- Maureen Laws (ML)
- Sharon Lee (SL)
- Stacey Runciman (SR)
- Lorna Stygall (LS)
- Vitorino long (VI)

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 1: Stop and Search 370509/111024/042615

### Grounds:

OBS: A male fitting the description of white male, eastern european accent wearing a black puffer jacket was seen at the Civic Drive Underpass  
INTEL: Member of the public reported that a white male with an eastern european accent and wearing a black puffer jacket was carrying a knife and had previously been involved in an altercation with the member of the public reporting.  
SUSP: Due to the subject being in the specific area where the altercation occurred just prior as well as matching the description given, I suspect he was in possession of a knife

### ISCRE Comments:

The grounds for this Stop/search lack detail:

What other description aside from white male in a black puffer jacket - an eastern European accent wouldn't assist in initial identification, were other white males in the vicinity?

What was the altercation and motivation with the mop/were they known/unknown to the suspect?

No knife was found, NFA, Can we review the BWV for to better understand this incident.

### Discussion:

BWV has previously been reviewed by ISCRE.

CC: Two males matching the description were found and detained under Section 1 of PACE. They were the only individuals in the subway, which was under CCTV surveillance. At that stage, it was unclear if either possessed a knife. The altercation was unknown at this stage and the suspects victim was known to the police.

SL: ISCRE reviewed the BWV which was very poor quality of the visual and sound. A concern was that the individual searched in the BWV was wearing a blue hoodie with a black gilet not a black puffer jacket. From the video we saw no knife. The suspect explained it was him that called the police causing some confusion when viewing the video. English was not the suspects first language and throughout the video it seemed he did not understand what was being said by the police. We didn't believe enough was done to help him understand.

EC: A male was arrested outside the scene following multiple calls. The subway, under full CCTV coverage, ensured no one entered or left. A homeless woman living there had been assaulted. The suspect we searched called the police, and an altercation occurred between him and the assailant. Conflicting reports made the situation unclear, and yes the body-worn camera footage lacked quality.

EC: No knife recovered.

JC: The male may not have fully understood the GOWISELY procedure due to language barriers. While he recognized "email," his overall comprehension was unclear, highlighting the need to balance scene safety with clear communication

SR: Are you reviewing how call handlers and officers ensure clear communication? Especially in complex situation such as this.

JC: Yes, we do review calls and have structured checklists for call takers. Calls are checked to confirm details, gather more information, and ensure the best response. Handling spontaneous and complex scenes can be challenging, but officer safety is always a priority.

Regarding language barriers, we aim to use clear, simple language without being patronizing. If necessary, once safety is ensured, we assess whether an interpreter is needed to help the individual fully understand the situation.

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 2: Stop and Search 371103/271024/195241

### Grounds:

OBS: While conducting a traffic stop on an unrelated matter, subject rode pass officer in a bicycle in a lit cigarette in his month, followed by a strong smell of cannabis. Subject was stopped by officer and admitted smoking a cannabis joint as well as having a small quantity of the same substance in his person. INTEL: No intel for drug SUSP: When speaking with officer the subject openly admitted having class B control substance in his person.

### ISCRE Comments:

This person was stopped based on the smell of cannabis, the officer has not noted any other suspicious behaviour so why was he stopped in the first instance? The supervisor has recorded a high level supervision account which we view as good practice. We would like to review this BWV to understand the officers actions.

### Discussion:

BWV was not available for ISCRE to review.

SL: The supervisor of this officer has provided a high level of supervision which we see as good practice:

You communicated respectfully but turned your back on the suspect multiple times. Go Wisely was partially used, missing the G and O. The suspect admitted to having cannabis; ensure justification for further search. You remained professional and empathetic, but consider if a cannabis warning was more appropriate than a community resolution.

Would an officer always stop and search someone riding by on a push bike if they smell cannabis while dealing with another incident?

V one of the officers, joined the meeting the body worn footage wasn't available. He's joined us to observe the importance of this public scrutiny meeting.

JB: The perpetrator stated the cannabis was in his tobacco pouch. If the officer had it before the search, it could be considered an illegal search, as they had already found what they were looking for.

CC: Relays Vitorino's written response: While conducting a traffic stop, I noticed a male on a bike smoking a joint, and I could smell cannabis. I didn't stop him immediately, but a minute later, I saw him again and stopped him using my blue light. He admitted to smoking cannabis. Based on this, I had grounds to search him under Section 23, and I found a small amount of cannabis. He admitted possession during the interview. I issued an ACR and referred him for further support. Regarding the body-worn footage, I mistakenly failed to label it correctly.

V: The individual told me where the cannabis was, so I searched him and found it in his trouser pocket. Normally, I'd ask them to stay where I can see their hands, but since people can lie, a full and systematic search is necessary to ensure nothing else illegal is on them.

SL: Going back to the supervisor comments, if a suspect tells you where the item is, is it necessary to search?

CC: The stop and search forms require you to provide a rationale for continuing the search. If this rationale isn't written down, it raises questions about how it can be justified. It was believed there was more on him than he admitted, but this wasn't documented.

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 3: Stop and Search 370855/271024/023413

### Grounds:

OBS: Male seen in public smoking with a female, strong smell of cannabis in the air. Male approached and asked what he was smoking, to which he admitted it was a joint. Searched to locate controlled drugs. INTEL: Male seen in public smoking with a female, strong smell of cannabis in the air. Male approached and asked what he was smoking, to which he admitted it was a joint. Searched to locate controlled drugs. SUSP: Male seen in public smoking with a female, strong smell of cannabis in the air. Male approached and asked what he was smoking, to which he admitted it was a joint. Searched to locate controlled drugs.

### ISCRE Comments:

We are trying to better understand the grounds for this search of controlled drugs.

Based on the smell of cannabis alone not being grounds to stop & search, although admission of smoking cannabis, What were the suspicious circumstances that led to the search for controlled drugs?

Was there intelligence on the suspect?

Was there suspicious behaviour not noted in the grounds?

Was the suspect known to the police?

Nothing found, NFA

### Discussion:

BWV was not availed for ISCRE to review

EC: Provides a response from the officer

I was aware of the process and was surprised by the concern over the grounds for the search, as the male admitted to possessing cannabis. The search was based on intelligence about drug dealing in the area, the smell of cannabis, and the male's admission. The male was known to police for drug use and supply. I acknowledge that the grounds should have detailed recent intelligence and mentioned the male's disposal of items before police arrived.

SL: More information on the reasoning and actions behind decisions would help better understand the situation.

JB: Was the female searched in this incident, and why is this the second body-worn video not available for review?

JC: The second body-worn video issue is being addressed, and while progress is being made, it's not resolved yet. Officers are being briefed on the importance of ensuring the video is available, and efforts to improve compliance are ongoing

EC: The female was not searched. The male was the one seen in possession of the cannabis. She was in company with the male who is smoking.

JC: The rationale is good, but it should have been included in the original grounds to avoid questions. The intelligence may have been more focused on the male, not the female, which could explain why the female wasn't searched, as the cannabis alone may not have justified it.

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 4: Taser SC-12112024-414

### Reason for use of Force:

- Prevent Escape
- Prevent Self-harm
- Prevent Offence
- Protect Other officers From Violence
- Protect Subject from Violence

### ISCRE Comments:

The suspect is noted to have a mental health condition with a severe injury I believe to his arm, which led to him being hospitalised. Given the suspects physical injury and mental health, how proportionate was the force used. Can we please review this BWV to better understand the officers use of force and to see how the suspect was handled.

### Discussion:

JC: Provides a response from the officer:

The BWV footage likely expired as it wasn't evidential or linked to any offence. The incident was medical. Male had cut an artery but wasn't a suspect. The Taser training team reviewed the footage as part of use-of-force oversight. Officers responded to reports of a male stabbing himself in a caravan, initially fearing another victim due to the blood. The male complied after being red-dotted with a Taser and received medical attention.

SL: If only that information was recorded in the officers grounds, we would have had clarity to what occurred. For example the self-inflicted injuries, not recorded.

JC: The lack of body-worn video is unfortunate, but PC Hammond's point on retention is valid. Since the individual wasn't a suspect and there was no investigation, keeping the footage wasn't required. The use of Taser appeared proportionate given the circumstances.

EC: The form lacked sufficient detail, though the CAD shows officers responded to a distressing mental health incident at 10:50

PM. The circumstances were difficult, but the justification for their actions wasn't fully reflected in the report.

SL: Can feedback on the lack of detail be given. We have a many forms where the grounds are not fully or clearly recorded, that extra detail added would allow for a much clearer understanding and scrutiny.

### Actions:

JC: *We will feed this back to officers. It's a common issue, and we're working to improve it.*

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 5: Use of Force Sc-06112024-68

### Reason for use of Force:

- Effect Arrest
- Protect other officers

### ISCRE Comments:

Can we please review this BWV to see the actions taken by the officer who states he used a punch to the suspects body as a distraction.

### Discussion:

ISCRE previously reviewed the BWV

EC: Provides a response from the officer

The male was a large build, known to have weapons and be anti-police. Entry was forced due to these risks. He resisted arrest, pushing an officer away. Parva spray was ineffective, and he kept his arms beneath him, raising concerns about weapon access or drug disposal. A distraction strike was used to gain control without causing serious injury. Baton or Taser were ruled out due to injury risks and close quarters. The strike allowed officers to handcuff him. Body-worn footage captured the event, and force was deemed necessary and proportionate under the Criminal Law Act.

JC: I am impressed with the detailed response from the officer and I will give some positive feedback. The lawful technique of a strike was used appropriately. The video was not shown beyond necessary internal scrutiny due to mild nudity.

SL: This is the first time I've encountered an officer using a punch as a distraction technique, which is why I wanted to bring it to the panel for us all to gain a better understanding.

ML: How many officers were present in the room?

JC: Five officers were present. Officers executed a Misuse of Drugs Act warrant in the early hours, which can be high-risk. They typically attend in sufficient numbers for safety

JB: Were any of the drugs or weapons being looked for found?

EC: Yes. He was arrested for concerning to supply drugs.

SL: This form highlights the importance of BWV as it provides clarity and accountability in use-of-force incidents. The footage allowed for a better understanding of the situation compared to the write up.

JC: I agree, The body worn video was a significant factor in understanding the situation and reasoning for use of force.

### Actions:

JC: Provide positive feedback for officers good response.

# CASES FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

## Case 6: Use of Force 376629124

### Reason for use of Force:

- Effect Stop and Search
- Secure Evidence

### ISCRE Comments:

Handcuffs used for controlled stop search - What were the behaviours presented by the suspect for force to be used?

### Discussion:

EC: Provides a response from the officer. The response is not as detailed as we would like. We have since gone back to gain further information which has not yet been received.

EC Provides the original response:

The stop and search was part of a planned operation at the suspect's property, involving several unknown individuals. The female was handcuffed for control during the search, as there was no prior intel on her or the males. Once the search was completed, the handcuffs were removed, and the dams reference will be provided once access is available.

JC: Should this case be classified as a stop and search, a 32 in an address or a section 23 Misuse of Drugs Act search?

EC: Confirms the operation was conducted under section 23, in partnership with housing, to address concerns related to antisocial behaviour, drug use, and drug supply at the dwelling. The aim was to support housing in their efforts to manage the situation.

FJ: Why are handcuffs used in this situation?  
What were the behaviours?

JC: The officer's response lacks detail, particularly regarding the rationale for handcuffing during a warrant execution. Handcuffing is often done for safety when entering an address with multiple people, but this wasn't adequately explained. Feedback should be provided to the officer for more clarity.

### Actions:

JC: Share further details with the panel once received the requested updates from the officer.

# AOB:

FJ: Raises a discussion regarding how officers mark that they have used some type of force when filling out a stop and search form.

The panel is made aware that when an officer fills out a stop and search form if they select "Yes" for the question "Was force used to facilitate search"? they then have a drop down box to select what type of force was used (ie, handcuffs, baton etc)

FJ: Request some further reasoning as to why the suspect in form 2 was not handcuffed while in a vehicle with an officer.

Discussion took place on how Officer V might not have felt the need to handcuff a person with cannabis, given his good rapport with individuals. They speculate that the person might not have been a real threat, possibly just someone casually using a controlled substance.

**Date of next Meeting:** Wednesday March 26th at Alde Valley Academy

Meeting ended at 17:49