

**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 2023.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Overview of review request</b>	<b>Verdict.</b>
<i>BC</i>	Further action needed regarding CCTV footage and clarification regarding an email.	Upheld.
<i>CD</i>	The response provide rationale behind the decisions taken	Not Upheld.
<i>DE</i>	Further clarification is needed in addressing two of the allegations.	Upheld
<i>EF</i>	The outcome letter provides evidence to support the statements referred to by Northumbria Police.	Not upheld

<i>FG</i>	The outcome letter addressed all the points in a reasonable and proportionate manner	Not upheld.
<i>GH</i>	Further clarification is required in relation to a number of points raised.	Upheld.
<i>HI</i>	The outcome letter refers to notes from a meeting, the rationale needs further understanding for the complainant.	Upheld.
<i>IJ</i>	Further clarification is need and clearer rationale to be provided	Upheld.
<i>JK</i>	The outcome letter recognised where further improvements could be made and the response was comprehensive	Not upheld.
<i>KL</i>	The outcome letter addressed the allegations and the response was very comprehensive.	Not upheld.
<i>LM</i>	The points relating to the review did not correlate with the complaint.	Not upheld.
<i>MN</i>	Linked to a previous complaint which was concluded in 2022. There were two points that needed further clarification and this was recommended to PSD.	Recommendations
<i>NO</i>	The outcome letter covered the allegations and provided rationale.	Not upheld.
<i>OP</i>	Requested that Northumbria Police review the body worn footage to determine if comments match outcome letter.	Upheld.
<i>PQ</i>	PSD provided the correct information in that the ICO was the correct body to contact.	Not upheld.
<i>QR</i>	The outcome addressed the points from the original complaint.	Not upheld.

<i>RS</i>	The outcome addressed all points from the original complaint. New points were raised by the complainant following the outcome from Northumbria Police. Such matters are not appropriate for reviews.	Not upheld.
<i>ST</i>	The outcome letter clearly explained the decisions taken by Northumbria Police in a reasonable and proportionate manner.	Not upheld.
<i>TU</i>	A number of points from the original complaint were not addressed and no contact made with the complainant	Upheld.
<i>UV</i>	The officers activated their body worn videos, this showed the officers interaction with the complainant.	Not upheld.
<i>VW</i>	The outcome letter addressed the points in a reasonable and proportionate manner.	Not upheld.
<i>WX</i>	The outcome clearly set out why the police investigation could not progress.	Not upheld.