

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 – April to June 2021.

Name	Overview of review request	Verdict.
AZ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>PSD believed the complaint was similar to one from 2020. Having reviewed the 2020 complaint and 2021 complaint – they were not similar. Recommended that allegation one is reconsidered as a new complaint,</p>	Upheld
BY	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>No evidence was provided to support the allegations made. Northumbria Police have no remit over complaints against Royal Mail.</p>	Not upheld
CX	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable	Not upheld

	<p>and proportionate.</p> <p>This complaint linked very closely to previous complaints and had already been addressed by Northumbria Police on a number of occasions and subject to previous appeals / reviews.</p>	
DW	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Allegation one had not been considered, it was not satisfactory to say it was dealt with as part of another process.</p>	Upheld.
EV	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>All the points in relation to the complaint were fully addressed and rationale provided.</p>	Not upheld.
FU	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>A number of the points mentioned in the outcome letter needed further clarification</p>	Upheld.
GT	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter clearly addressed each point and rationale provided.</p>	Not upheld.

HS	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The investigating officer did not provide rationale to support his decision. Appropriate research had been undertaken, but not shared in the outcome letter.</p>	Upheld.
IR	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Further clarification was provided and an option to submit a civil claim. All actions were reasonable and proportionate</p>	Not upheld.
JQ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The complaint was not about policing, it was regarding another public service. Advice given to where to direct complaint.</p>	Not upheld.
KP	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The points that were raised following an earlier review were addressed. The Reviewing Officer asked that the complainant be contacted to ensure she understood the content of the outcome letter, as their legal</p>	Not Upheld.

	representative raised this as a concern.	
LO	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer found that the level of service was not acceptable by Northumbria Police. The Reviewing Officer determined that contacting the police direct with a complaint is the best way forward so it can be logged and progressed.</p>	Not upheld.
MN	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Civil claims are a separate process to complaints. Outcome reasonable and proportionate re complaint. The reviewing officer has asked that the Head of Legal review the civil claim.</p>	Not Upheld.
NM	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Reviewing Officer was not satisfied with the actions taken by Northumbria Police and requested that the complaint be investigated.</p>	Upheld.
OL	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.	Not upheld.

	<p>The investigating officer provided a comprehensive response, which addressed the points raised. Further clarification was sought by the complainant as part of the review – these questions were answered.</p>	
PK	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The main complaint was addressed with comprehensive information to why certain decisions had been taken.</p> <p>There was an issue with the amount of time it took Northumbria Police to conclude the complaint. This would not have changed the overall decision, but a learning recommendation was sent to Northumbria Police.</p>	Not upheld.
QJ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The main complaint was not a matter for Northumbria Police but for Trading Standards.</p> <p>All other points were addressed in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	Not upheld.
RI	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld.

	Having reviewed the complaint and the ten points as part of the review, a reasonable and proportionate response was provided. The reviewing officer recommended that if the complainant wanted personal information relating to them, they should make a Subject Access Request.	
SH	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate. The investigating officer addressed all points and provided rationale to each area.	Not upheld
TG	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate. The outcome letter clearly addressed each of the allegations and provided rationale.	Not upheld
UF	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate. The complaint outcome covered a number of areas and provided relevant legislation and rationale	Not upheld.
VE	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.	Upheld

	Having reviewed the papers, there was information missing from an email that should have been passed on and wasn't – this would have helped the complainant in their next steps	
WD	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate. Two parts of the complaint had not been addressed in the outcome letter – this needed further attention.	Upheld
XC	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate. As part of the complaint needed further work, the original complaint was sent to PSD for reassessment.	Upheld.
YB	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate. Having reviewed the case, Northumbria Police adhered to the request of the courts. The actions of Northumbria Police are reasonable and proportionate.	Not upheld.
ZA	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate. The outcome letter addressed all the points raised and rationale was provided.	Not upheld.

AZ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>A number of allegations were made against officers. Having reviewed the footage and listened to the calls, the evidence did not support the allegations made,</p>	Not upheld.
BY	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The review was for allegation one, which Northumbria Police determined the level of service not being acceptable. As part of the review, the reviewing officer recommended a number of further actions, including all comms staff being update on the process of dealing with the issues raised in this complaint.</p>	Not upheld.
CX	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter fully addressed all issues in the outcome letter and provided rationale behind the decisions taken.</p>	Not Upheld
DW	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not Upheld

	A comprehensive letter was provided to the complainant, which fully addressed each allegation.	
EV	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The investigating officer should have contacted the complainant when promised, but this would not have changed the outcome of the complaint.</p> <p>The investigating officer did provide a response which provided rationale.</p>	Not upheld
FU	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed the complaints and provided rationale. The request for a review had no relevance to the original complaint.</p>	Not upheld
GT	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The majority of the complaint was answered, but one question did not receive a reasonable and proportionate response.</p>	Upheld
HS	Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.	Not upheld.

	<p>The Investigating Officer conducted a fair assessment of the complaint and offered his contact details and those of his team should the complainant need to contact him in the future.</p>	
IR	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Allegations one and two were repetitive of a complaint made in 2019. There was confusion around the dates in relation to allegation three, that needs further investigation.</p>	Upheld
JQ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Having reviewed the CCTV footage available and associated statements, the case was handled in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	Not upheld
KP	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Northumbria Police provided a response that addressed the concerns raised and clear rationale.</p>	Not upheld.
LO	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Upheld.

	The majority of the complaint was answered, there was one element that needed further clarification.	
MN	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Complainant stated they had evidence to support their claims, but did not provide it.</p>	Not Upheld.
NM	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The complaint had been dealt with twice previously and response provided.</p>	Not upheld.
OL	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>A full comprehensive response had been provided by Northumbria Police, which addressed the specifics of the original complaint in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	Not upheld