

**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 2022.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Overview of review request</b>	<b>Verdict.</b>
<i>AB</i>	Raised concerned about parking, was not happy with the investigation. The outcome letter provided evidence of the actions of Northumbria Police to deal with the matter.	Not upheld
<i>BC</i>	Concerns raised that not all of complaint had been addressed. Further work needed by Northumbria Police.	Upheld
<i>CD</i>	Concerns raised that reports of crime were not being actioned. Northumbria Police clearly explained why the matter was not being progressed.	Not upheld.
<i>DE</i>	The outcome letter fully addressed all points raised in a reasonable and proportionate manner.	Not upheld.
<i>EF</i>	The outcome letter did not provide assurances that a previous complaint referred to had been addressed properly.	Upheld.

<i>FG</i>	The outcome letter was comprehensive and provide rationale to all the points raised.	Not upheld.
<i>GH</i>	The outcome letter did not address all the points raised and further information was needed to be provided by officers present.	Upheld
<i>HI</i>	The outcome letter addressed all the points raised in a reasonable and proportionate manner	Not upheld.
<i>IJ</i>	The Investigating Officer provided a comprehensive response to the complainant that addressed all points.	Not upheld
<i>JK</i>	The outcome letter addressed the points raised in the original complaint.	Not upheld.
<i>KL</i>	The Investigating Officer provided a comprehensive response to the complainant that addressed all points.	Not upheld
<i>LM</i>	Northumbria Police have liaised closely with the family to address the concerns. The outcome letter provides rationale that supports the decisions taken.	Not upheld.
<i>MN</i>	The response addresses the points raised in the complaint and refers to previous historical complaints.	Not upheld.
<i>NO</i>	The response was satisfactory and addressed the original complaints, rationale was provided. The RO advised the complainant if they were not happy to submit a civil claim.	Not upheld.
<i>OP</i>	The complaint was about another organisation, appropriate advice given.	Not upheld.

<i>PQ</i>	The decisions of the Investigating Officer were supported by CCTV footage.	Not upheld.
<i>QR</i>	The actions taken by the officer were reasonable and proportionate to ensure support from partners.	Not upheld.
<i>RS</i>	The outcome letter addressed all points, however, one element needed further consideration and this was referred to the legal department of Northumbria Police.	Not upheld.
<i>ST</i>	The complaint related to matters that have been addressed in previous complaints and one of the issues continues to be under investigation.	Not upheld.
<i>TU</i>	Following a previously upheld complaint, a new outcome was provided. A review request was submitted for the new outcome, which addressed the two allegations in a reasonable and proportionate manner.	Not upheld.
<i>UV</i>	The quality of the outcome letter needs revisited and the Investigating Officer needs to recontact the complainant.	Upheld.
<i>VW</i>	The police complaints procedure is not the appropriate avenue to raise the concerns they had.	Not upheld.
<i>WX</i>	The issues raised are a matter for Court, rather than the police complaints system.	Not upheld.
<i>XY</i>	Two reviews were submitted, re a complaint about a scheme that is not administered by Northumbria Police.	Not upheld.

YZ	Two reviews were submitted, re a complaint about a scheme that is not administered by Northumbria Police.	Not upheld.
----	---	-------------