

From the 1st February 2020, legislation changes resulted in the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner being responsible for certain reviews following a complaint that has been dealt with by the Professional Standards Department of Northumbria Police (further information can be found at www.northumbria-pcc.gov.uk).

In the spirit of openness and transparency, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Northumbria will publish review outcomes.

Relevant Appeal Body (RAB) - *Office of Police and Crime Commissioner Reviews*:

Outcomes – January and March 2021.

Name	Overview of review request	Verdict.
<i>RI</i>	<p>Following an incident with another person, which resulted in police attendance a complaint was received in how the police responded to the matter.</p> <p>The reviewing officer determined that the views of the complainant had not been fully considered, action was needed regarding correspondence that was sent from the complainant and issues around attachments needed addressing.</p>	Upheld
<i>QJ</i>	<p>The complainants concerns go back to 2013 and relate to another force.</p> <p>Northumbria Police is not the appropriate authority to deal with complaints relating to other police forces.</p>	Not upheld

	<p>The response from Northumbria Police was reasonable and proportionate.</p>	
PK	<p>Four allegations were submitted. Northumbria Police provided a comprehensive response in relation to allegation one.</p> <p>Allegations 2, 3 and 4 were repetitive of issues that had been submitted a number of times and had been determined at appeal previously.</p>	Not upheld
OL	<p>Complainant believed his reports of crime had not been investigated properly.</p> <p>The investigating officer agreed that two of the responses were reasonable and proportionate as they provided plenty of information to address the concerns.</p> <p>The response to four reports of crime did not provide enough information. This resulted in the outcome letter not being reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Upheld.
NM	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The incident referred to occurred over 17 years ago and due to data retention policy, the information is no longer available.</p>	Not upheld.

	<p>Due to this it would not be reasonable or proportionate for Northumbria Police to re-open the investigation.</p> <p>The Reviewing Officer did provide further information in relation to how the issues can be addressed now. Relevant web details were given.</p>	
MN	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The reviewing officer found that Northumbria Police had attempted to address the issues, but not enough detail had been provided in the response and some of the statements made by Northumbria Police required further details to provide clarity and understanding.</p>	Upheld.
LO	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The reviewing officer found that each of the incidences were addressed with a rationale provided. Northumbria Police provided a sound response which addressed the points raised in the original complaint.</p>	Not upheld.
KP	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not Upheld

	<p>An administrative error caused an email to be missed and not responded to. An apology was offered and learning would be given to the staff member involved. This outcome is reasonable and proportionate.</p>	
JP	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Having reviewed the case, it is clear that Northumbria Police addressed the complaints as set out by the complainant. The outcome is reasonable and proportionate</p>	Not upheld.
IQ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Having reviewed the case, it is clear that the matter was dealt with in a reasonable and proportionate manner. Northumbria Police advised contacting the Information Management Unit to allow the other part of their request to be considered.</p>	Not upheld.
HR	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The investigating officer provided a comprehensive response, which addressed all the points.</p>	Not upheld.

GS	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Part of the review request linked to a previous review. Northumbria Police addressed all points in a reasonable and proportionate manner. The new points were addressed by the investigation officer and the information provided addressed the issues raised.</p>	Not upheld.
FT	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Various references to historical complaints were made, under legislation these cannot be reviewed. In relation to latest review request, the points made in the complaint were addressed and rationale provided.</p>	Not upheld.
EU	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The issues raised were a matter for the IOPC to consider rather than the OPCC.</p>	Not upheld.
DV	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter was very defensive of Northumbria Police, a</p>	Upheld

	number of points needed either clarification or further info. Further work is needed to fully address the issues	
CW	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>There was no evidence to support comments made, further complaints have already been addressed and concluded.</p>	Not upheld.
BX	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The points that the complainant wanted to be considered had no bearing on the case, this was explained to the complainant.</p>	Not upheld.
AY	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>This matter had already been subject to a review by Northumbria Police, it is not possible to request a double review.</p>	Not upheld
BZ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Complaint related to web submission by a person abroad – no crime had</p>	Not upheld.

	been committed in the Northumbria Force area	
CY	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The investigating officer addressed all the points raised in the initial complaint in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	Not upheld.
DX	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Reviewing Officer was satisfied that allegation one was fully addressed, however only half of allegation two was addressed. This needs further action to complete the process.</p>	Upheld
EW	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The investigation was evidence based and this was provided as part of the review.</p>	Not upheld
FV	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The complaint addressed each of the complaints and rationale was provided to support decisions taken.</p>	Not upheld.

GU	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Reviewing Officer could not determine where the complaint had been previously addressed. Requested that PSD look at one specific part of the complaint.</p>	Upheld.
HT	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The response was very comprehensive and dealt with all issues, providing rationale to each area.</p>	Not upheld.
IS	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The review points that were submitted linked to a previous complaint and were not able to be considered.</p>	Not upheld.
JR	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Northumbria Police followed ACPO guidelines and a full explanation was provided.</p>	Not upheld
KQ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld.

	Full explanation was provided in outcome letter	
LP	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed the issues in the original complaint and further explanation was provided.</p>	Not upheld.
MO	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed the issues in a reasonable and proportionate manner. Management advice was given</p>	Not upheld
NN	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Part of the original complaint had not been addressed and clearer clarification was required for part of the response.</p>	Upheld.
OM	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Due to the style of the written response, it was hard to determine which questions had been answered and which hadn't. Recommended that the questions be specifically answered.</p>	Upheld

PL	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>All points in the original complaint were addressed and rationale provided.</p>	Not upheld
QK	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The issues raised were virtually the same that had been raised in complaints going back to 2010 and appealed to the then IPCC.</p>	Not upheld.
RJ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>A comprehensive response was provided in relation to the issues raised. All points were reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld
SI	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer requested that the case be reopened and all evidence checked. This was completed. The actions of Northumbria Police were reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld.

TH	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The complainant did not wish to engage with the investigating officer. All points in original complaint were addressed</p>	Not upheld.
UG	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>A number of the issues went back to 2015 and had been addressed previously and appealed to the then IPCC.</p>	Not upheld.
VF	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter offered points relating to the complaints letter</p>	Not upheld.