

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 – October to December 2020.

Name	Overview of review request	Verdict.
WB – 1	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The Reviewing Officer agreed the actions of Northumbria Police were reasonable and proportionate as the matter had been thoroughly investigated.</p> <p>Body Worn Video footage covered the whole event and was able to substantiate the comments in the outcome letter.</p>	Not Upheld
XA – 2	<p>The complainant submitted a complaint in July and was not offered a review by Northumbria Police. This was an oversight that resulted in the complainant not being able to request a review.</p>	Upheld

	<p>When the reviewing officer read the original outcome letter, there was terminology used that needed clarification. Also the reviewing officer suggested that the complainant should have been contacted to discuss his concerns.</p> <p>A second complaint was received and one issue had not been picked up as a complaint.</p> <p>The reviewing officer has asked that the issues from both complaints be addressed as one complaint to ensure no confusion.</p>	
YZ – 3	<p>Though Northumbria Police determined the level of service as not acceptable, the complainant was concerned that lessons would not be learnt.</p> <p>The reviewing officer found that the outcome was reasonable and proportionate, in line with current rules and legislation.</p> <p>However, the reviewing officer believed that further improvements could be made to deliver a better service. These recommendations were made to Northumbria Police and the RO has asked for a response addressing each of them.</p>	Not Upheld

ZA – 4	<p>Following a search of the complainant's home, the officer clicked the wrong code on the force computer when inputting the details, which differed from the leaflet left at the time.</p> <p>This admin error did not change the outcome or invalid the process.</p>	Not upheld.
YB – 5	<p>The complainant has raised concerns over twenty years about various organisations, including Northumbria Police.</p> <p>Northumbria Police responded to very similar issues raised in 2016. With no new evidence being provided in 2020, the actions of Northumbria Police were reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld.
XC – 6	<p>The complainant raised concerns that his complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The outcome letter did not provide enough detail to the concerns raised.</p> <p>There were also a number of concerns that were not fully addressed. The reviewing officer has asked that these concerns are addressed along with the investigation questions raised via the review request</p>	Upheld

<p>WD – 7</p>	<p>The complainant raised concerns that his complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The complaints made were very similar to those made previously and no new evidence was provided to support the statements made.</p> <p>The reviewing officer agreed with Northumbria Police that these matters had already been addressed and it is not reasonable and proportionate to re-open.</p>	<p>Not Upheld</p>
<p>VE – 8</p>	<p>The complainant raised concerns that his complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The matter which the complaint relates to occurred in 2012. Information was reviewed from the time.</p> <p>The reviewing officer agreed with Northumbria Police that these matters had already been addressed and it is not reasonable and proportionate to re-open.</p>	<p>Not upheld</p>
<p>UF – 9</p>	<p>The complainant raised concerns that his complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The investigating officer gave a comprehensive response to the allegations made.</p>	<p>Not upheld</p>

	<p>The complainant was not part of the conversations and was listening from their door.</p> <p>The reviewing officer agreed with Northumbria Police that a reasonable and proportionate response was sent.</p>	
TG – 10	<p>The complainant raised concerns that their complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The investigating officer gave a comprehensive response to the allegations made.</p> <p>The review request did not link to any issues related to the original complaint.</p> <p>The reviewing officer agreed with Northumbria Police that a reasonable and proportionate response was sent.</p>	Not upheld
SH – 11	<p>The complainant raised concerns that their complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The complaints link back to issues that have been dealt with previously.</p>	Not upheld.
RI – 12	<p>The complainant raised concerns that their complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The complainant wanted a review of his contact with the police since 1996.</p>	Not upheld.

	<p>The Reviewing Officer explained that it was not reasonable and proportionate to review historical contact with the police since 1996.</p> <p>The response from Northumbria Police was reasonable and proportionate.</p>	
QJ – 13	<p>The complainant raised concerns that their complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The complainant felt that they were not taken seriously by Northumbria Police and did not understand the issues that they wanted to raised</p> <p>The investigating officer gave a comprehensive reply which addressed the concerns. The response from Northumbria Police was reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld
PK – 14	<p>The complainant raised concerns that their complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>Following a legal matter, the complainant raised concerns that it was taking too long to get his equipment returned.</p> <p>The outcome letter clearly explained the reasons for the delay.</p>	Not upheld.

OL – 15	<p>The complainant raised concerns that their complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The complainant refers to a previous complaint that was investigated, they took up the right of appeal with the then IPCC and it was not upheld.</p> <p>The outcome from Northumbria Police was reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld
NM – 16	<p>The complainant raised concerns that their complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The complaint stemmed from the belief that the investigation was not undertaken properly. The Reviewing Officer determined that relevant advice was sought and given to support the decision of officers.</p> <p>The outcome from Northumbria Police was reasonable and proportionate</p>	Not upheld
MN – 17	<p>The complainant raised concerns that their complaints had not been addressed properly.</p> <p>The complainant raised a number of points regarding the investigation, however these were all answered by the investigating officer. As part of the review, the reviewing officer provided further clarification to the concerns raised. There were also a number of</p>	Not upheld.

	<p>points that could not be addressed as they were not part of the original review.</p> <p>The outcome from Northumbria Police was reasonable and proportionate.</p>	
LO – 18	<p>The complainant raised concerns that he had not been contacted to discuss his complaint by the investigating officer.</p> <p>The review was upheld, the reviewing officer recommended that the complainant be contacted to discuss his concerns and to see if their comments would change the outcome report.</p>	Upheld
KP – 19	<p>The complainant raised complaints about an investigation, a number of points were submitted.</p> <p>The Investigating officer addressed the specific points of the complaint and the reviewing officer determined the matter was dealt with proportionately and reasonable</p>	Not upheld.
JQ – 20	<p>The complainant was not happy with the outcome of their complaint.</p> <p>Having reviewed the case Northumbria Police gave a full explanation to all complaints. In relation to complaint three, the investigating officer determined that</p>	Not upheld

	<p>the actions of one of the officers in relation to that matter was unacceptable. The Reviewing officer agreed with the findings.</p>	
IR – 21	<p>The complainant was not happy with the outcome of a complaint made in 2018.</p> <p>The complainant did not take up the right to appeal and the matter was closed. Having reviewed the file, full explanations were provided at the time and it would not be reasonable and proportionate to re-investigate the matter</p>	Not upheld.
HS – 22	<p>The complainant was not happy with the outcome of their complaint.</p> <p>Having reviewed the documentation, part of the complaint had not been addressed and further clarification was needed.</p>	Upheld
GT – 23	<p>The complainant was not happy with the outcome of their complaint.</p> <p>Having reviewed all the documents, it was clear that all points had been addressed, in a reasonable and proportionate manner. Further points were raised as part of the review, however they were not part of the original complaint.</p>	Not upheld.
FU – 24	<p>The complainant was not happy with the outcome of their complaint.</p>	Not upheld

	<p>The majority of the initial complaint focused on early contact, which was poor but had been resolved by a senior officer. Therefore this element of the complaint had been dealt with in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p> <p>Other points in relation to the complaint had been addressed in a comprehensive way and Northumbria Police have endeavoured to address the issues raised.</p> <p>The reviewing officer was satisfied that the complaint had been dealt with in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	
EV – 25	<p>The complainant was not happy with how his complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>Following a previous complaint which was upheld, Northumbria Police provided a comprehensive response to the outstanding issues.</p>	Not upheld
DW – 26	<p>The complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>The issues raised had been long running, over many years. The reviewing officer noted that Northumbria Police have attempted to resolve issues and work with partners.</p>	Not upheld.

	<p>The review was based on further questions from the outcome letter. The response from Northumbria Police was reasonable and proportionate.</p>	
CX – 27	<p>The complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>The complaint relates to previous incidences that relate to Covid-19 and the actions of Northumbria Police officers.</p> <p>The complainant does not agree with the actions taken by Northumbria Police, however, the complaint was fully answered in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	Not upheld
BY – 28	<p>The complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>The complaint relates to driving. A number of questions that were asked in the original complaint were not addressed.</p> <p>The Reviewing officer has made a number of recommendations to PSD to address the outstanding issues.</p>	Upheld.
AZ – 29	<p>The complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p>	Not upheld

	<p>The complaint was virtually the same that had been considered by PSD in previous years.</p> <p>It was reasonable and proportionate of PSD not to undertake an investigation for a matter that has already been appealed to the then IPCC.</p>	
ZA – 30	<p>The complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>A number of points had not been addressed and needed further clarification.</p>	Upheld
YB - 31	<p>The Complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>Upon review, all the points that were raised in the original complaint had been addressed. The investigation officer also address a number of other points that the complainant requested answers to.</p>	Not upheld.
XC – 32	<p>The Complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>A meeting had been cancelled by the complainant, but it was clear that they wanted this re-arranged, as this did not happen the complainant felt they</p>	Upheld.

	<p>did not have the opportunity to share other information that they had.</p> <p>The reviewing officer requested that the meeting be rearranged so the complainant can provide the information to Northumbria Police to consider.</p>	
WD - 33	<p>The Complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>The issues had been addressed earlier in the year and recorded. Northumbria Police acknowledged at the time their error and put solutions in place to address it. All the actions were reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld.
VE – 34	<p>The Complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>Having reviewed the original complaint, the response from Northumbria Police addressed each point in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	Not upheld.
UF - 35	<p>The Complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>The complaint reflected the issues that were raised in 2019, which had been investigated and an appeal offered and taken up. It was therefore</p>	Not upheld.

	reasonable and proportionate for Northumbria Police not to reinvestigate issues that had already been dealt with	
TG – 36	<p>The Complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>The issues related to matters from 2019 which falls to the IOPC to deal with as the relevant appeal body. The latest outcome letter addressed the other points in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	Not upheld
SH - 37	<p>The Complainant was not happy with how the complaint had been addressed.</p> <p>The issues relate to an issue that was first dealt with by PSD in 2014 (and a further six times between 2014 and 2020). The issues raised continue to be the same as those from 2014.</p> <p>The latest outcome letter addressed the reasons why it was not reasonable and proportionate to re-open the matter.</p>	Not upheld