

From the 1<sup>st</sup> 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](http://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 – July to September 2020.

Name	Overview of review request	Verdict.
CV	<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 all the points that were raised in the review were addressed in the response from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The reviewing officer appreciated that CV was not happy with the response, but no evidence was provided to show what was stated was wrong.</p>	Not upheld.
Not Progressed	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>After the Reviewing Officer had considered the documents, he</p>	Referred to IOPC via Northumbria Police.

	<p>determined that the OPCC was not the Relevant Appeal Body for such matters. The case was referred back to the Professional Standards Department advising them that the IOPC would be the relevant review body.</p>	
DU	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The Reviewing Officer determined the actions of Northumbria were not reasonable and proportionate as not all the points had been covered.</p> <p>The reviewing officer raised the point that a retired officer had not been contacted to provide an explanation for the delay in dealing with the case. It was requested that contact be made.</p> <p>A number of organisational learning points were also recommended.</p>	Upheld.
ET	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The Reviewing Officer determined that a comprehensive response was provided to address the concerns raised.</p>	Not upheld

	One organisational learning point was recommended to Northumbria Police	
FS	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>As the complaint was recorded prior to the changes in regulations (August and December 2019), the RAB should be the Chief Constable</p>	Referred back to Northumbria Police.
GR	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The Complainant listed a number of complaints, however, it appeared that he was not contacted to discuss his concerns by Northumbria Police and some of the issues raised by the complainant were misinterpreted.</p> <p>The reviewing officer has asked that the complainant be contacted and his concerns discussed and agree a way forward. Also all the documents should also be reviewed to ensure a full understanding of what is being raised.</p>	Upheld
HQ	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The complainant made five complaints, of which a review was requested on two elements. Upon</p>	Not upheld

	<p>seeking further advice and guidance, it was clear that the two elements raised had been fully addressed.</p>	
IP	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>Of the four allegation, IP focused on three of the allegations in the request for a review.</p> <p>The investigating officer undertook a comprehensive investigation and provided responses to all of the areas raised. College of Policing guidelines had been followed.</p> <p>Part of the complaint referred to an earlier complaint from 2019 (which could not be considered as it wasn't part of this complaint).</p>	Not upheld
JO	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>JO was not happy with some of the responses in the outcome letter, they also sought clarification on points raised – which I provided.</p> <p>The letter did have a number of admin errors (dates etc), but this would not have affected the overall decision.</p>	Not upheld

KN	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The complainant raised a number of comments about their arrest and time in custody.</p> <p>The reviewing officer raised further points that Northumbria Police answered. The outcome letter provided clear responses to the points raised in the review request.</p>	Not upheld.
LM	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The complainant thinks they were assaulted 15 years ago and wants the case reopened. Northumbria Police informed him that there was no CCTV, no witnesses and the complainant could not recall what happened on the evening in question.</p> <p>The reviewing officer agreed with the outcome by Northumbria Police.</p>	Not upheld.
ML	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The incident related to a stolen car. The level of service by Northumbria Police was found to be not acceptable by PSD.</p>	Passed to Civil Claims.

	<p>However, there was no recommendation in how to address the request for compensation. As such matters do not sit with the reviewing officer, this papers were passed to Civil Claims to progress and make contact with the complainant.</p> <p>The reviewing officer agreed with the outcome of Northumbria Police.</p>	
NK	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The issue relates to parking in Northumberland that has been ongoing since 2012. Police have previously given advice and the complainant sought advice from others in 2012/13.</p> <p>Following an incident in 2020 a new complainant was submitted. However, the complainant wished to refer to correspondence from 2012 and previous decisions.</p> <p>Explained that protocol and guidance can change. Northumbria Police fully addressed the complaints.</p> <p>The reviewing officer agreed with the outcome by Northumbria Police.</p>	Not upheld.

OJ	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The complainant felt that the officer did not treat them with respect. Various complaints were lodged against the officer.</p> <p>Having reviewed the body worn video footage, the reviewing officer felt the police officer dealt with the complainant in a professional manner and could not find examples of where the officer was rude or bullying.</p> <p>The reviewing officer agreed with the outcome by Northumbria Police.</p>	Not upheld.
PI	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The complainant requested a review seeking further clarification re ANPR and how they were dealt with by the officer.</p> <p>Having reviewed all the evidence, the reviewing officer was satisfied that the complainants concerns were fully addressed and he agreed with the outcome by Northumbria Police</p>	Not upheld.

QH	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The concerns were that Northumbria Police had failed to investigate a crime fully, failed to provide updates, did not believe the case was given priority. Complainant wanted return of laptop</p> <p>The reviewing officer determined that the response was not of a standard that would address the concerns and Northumbria Police offered no remedy.</p> <p>A number of recommendations were suggested by the reviewing officer.</p>	Upheld
RG	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The complainant stated that they were submitting new evidence that had not been considered.</p> <p>The reviewing officer determined that much of what had been raised had been dealt with as part of the original complaint in August 2019 and at the appeal in November 2019.</p>	Not upheld.



	Having reviewed the evidence, the reviewing officer agreed with the decision of Northumbria Police	
SF	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>Northumbria Police agreed with the complainant that the level of service provided was not acceptable.</p> <p>The complainant felt that the investigating officer did not provide sufficient information and the officers were quick to dismiss the complainants request. Having reviewed the papers the investigating officer clearly recognises this and informed the level of service provided was not acceptable.</p> <p>The complainant felt the apology was not specific and was a standard generic paragraph. The reviewing officer agreed that this element should be looked at – but it would not change the fact that the complaint was handled in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p> <p>Having reviewed the evidence, the reviewing officer agreed with the decision of Northumbria Police</p>	Not upheld

TE	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>This case was reported in 2014 and dealt with and recorded by Northumbria Police.</p> <p>In 2017 a complaint was received and again in 2020. The most recent complaints mirrored those that were lodged in 2017.</p> <p>The matter had previously been fully investigated by Northumbria Police and the concerns addressed.</p>	Not upheld.
UD	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The case was originally investigated by Northumbria Police in 2014. The complainant lodged a complaint in 2015 and 2018 and was offered the right of an appeal at the time.</p> <p>As much of the information raised in 2020 relates to the investigation and the matters considered in complaints from 2015 and 2018, the reviewing officer agreed it was not reasonable and proportionate to investigate the matter again.</p>	Not upheld

VC	<p>This review was requested as the complainant was not happy with the outcome from Northumbria Police.</p> <p>The complainant has a number of complaints ongoing. However, the complainant wanted to lodge new complaints, however, when submitting the review request information from previous complaints were mixed in with the new complaints and could not be considered.</p> <p>Clarification provided to the complainant and that existing complaints are being progressed and Northumbria Police will be in touch.</p>	Not upheld