

**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 – January and March 2022.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Overview of review request</b>	<b>Verdict.</b>
<i>AB</i>	<p>The complainant felt that the Investigating Officer investigating his complaint was not keeping in touch with him.</p> <p>The outcome letter listed the contact by the officer which was reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>A number of points were included in this review which were not valid as they linked to another complaint.</p>	<b>Not Upheld.</b>
<i>CD</i>	<p>The complainant submitted a review that linked to a previous complaint that had already been reviewed and concluded.</p>	<b>Not Upheld.</b>
<i>EF</i>	<p>The complainant was not satisfied with the response. Limited reasons were submitted for the review.</p>	<b>Not Upheld.</b>

	Northumbria Police had worked hard to engage with the complainant and provided a response to all the questions.	
<i>GH</i>	Having reviewed the original complaint, one point had not been addressed and a further point needed more information to support the statement made.	Upheld.
<i>IJ</i>	The Investigating Officer provided a comprehensive response and addressed the additional points raised through the review.	Not upheld.
<i>KL</i>	The complainant was not happy with how Northumbria Police initially dealt with the complainant. Northumbria Police had addressed the complaints but did not provide data that was requested. The reviewing officer offered to get this information – but it would not have changed the outcome of the final decision.	Not upheld.
<i>MN</i>	Allegation two needed further work to be undertaken by Northumbria Police to address the specific points raised.	Upheld.
<i>OP</i>	This was a matter that should have been referred to the Court via an appeal. It was not a valid complaint against the police.	Not upheld.
<i>QR</i>	This was a neighbour dispute, the complainant made a number of complaints which were not supported by the CCTV that was available. Northumbria Police addressed all the	Not upheld.

	points in a reasonable and proportionate manner.	
<i>ST</i>	The complaint was investigated by Northumbria Police to a reasonable and proportionate level. Response given to the concerns raised when the complaint was initially made.	Not upheld.
<i>UV</i>	The complaint related to issues over a number of years. Complaints regarding the handling of investigations and conduct of officers were fully addressed with rationale provided.	Not upheld.
<i>WX</i>	There were a number of points not addressed from the original complaint. The Reviewing Officer felt the tone of the letter failed to acknowledge the feelings of the complainant.	Upheld.
<i>YZ</i>	The complainant received a response that fully addressed all the concerns raised. There was one omission of information, which was provided in the review outcome – this would not have changed the overall decision.	Not upheld.
<i>ZA</i>	The complainant was offered an apology on behalf of Northumbria Police and the officer concerned would undertake RPRP. These actions were reasonable and proportionate for the complaint that was made.	Not upheld
<i>YB</i>	A number of points were addressed, but one of the crimes referred to had been omitted and needs information provided.	Upheld.

<i>XC</i>	The response from Northumbria Police addressed all the points in the outcome letter in a reasonable and proportionate manner. The complainant submitted further questions as part of the review which could not be considered as they were not part of the original complaint.	Not Upheld.
<i>WD</i>	The response from Northumbria Police covered the three allegations in a reasonable and proportionate manner. Rationale was provided to help provide further clarity.	Not Upheld.
<i>VE</i>	The outcome letter addressed the concerns raised and provide rationale behind the decisions taken in a reasonable and proportionate manner.	Not Upheld.
<i>UF</i>	The outcome letter fully addressed he concerns raised. Following the outcome letter, further questions were raised which could not be addressed as part of the review as they were not part of the original complaint.	Not Upheld.
<i>TG</i>	The complaint was very similar to what had been submitted three times previously, which had also been reviewed by the OPCC and previously the IPCC regarding an incident that happened twelve years ago.	Not Upheld.
<i>SH</i>	A number of points that were promised by Northumbria Police had not been addressed as set out in an earlier email.	Upheld.
<i>RI</i>	The complaint was not fully addressed and the service to the complainant	Upheld

	was not reasonable and proportionate.	
<i>QJ</i>	The complaint was addressed in a reasonable and proportionate manner. Rationale was provided by the Investigating officer	Not Upheld.
<i>PK</i>	There was ambiguity regarding the words used on a telephone call and part of the original complaint had not been addressed.	Upheld.
<i>OL</i>	The Investigating Officer did not re-contact the complainant as promised. The Reviewing Officer also wanted to see the statements from the officers involved, which were not included.	Upheld
<i>NM</i>	The Investigating Officer covered the major points to the latest complaint, which also incorporated points relating to a previous complaint (which had been concluded). The response was reasonable and proportionate.	Not upheld.
<i>MN</i>	The Investigating Officer attempted to contact the complainant on a number of occasions – which were not responded to. The outcome letter addressed all points in a reasonable and proportionate manner.	Not upheld.
<i>LO</i>	The Investigating Officer felt that more care was needed by Northumbria Police at the beginning of the process to understand the issues raised.	Upheld.
<i>KP</i>	The Investigating Officer was satisfied that the outcome letter addressed the allegations in a reasonable and proportionate manner. However,	Not upheld.

	clarification should be given regarding a number of points – however, this would not change the overall outcome.	
<i>JQ</i>	The correct procedures had not been followed, which warranted the complaint to be re-investigated	Upheld
<i>IR</i>	The response was reasonable and proportionate and addressed the issues raised.	Not upheld.
<i>HS</i>	This complaint took way too long to address, further investigations should have been conducted. The response was too defensive of Northumbria Police and did not appreciate the views of the complainant. Reviewing Officer suggested that the complaint be reinvestigated	Upheld
<i>GT</i>	The complaint was reasonable and proportionate in its response, clarification was needed on what the learning outcomes.	Not upheld
<i>FU</i>	The complainant received a response that was reasonable and proportionate, it was clear the issues that were addressed.	Not upheld.
<i>EV</i>	The complainant received an outcome letter that was very comprehensive and dealt with all matters in a reasonable and proportionate manner.	Not upheld.

