

**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 – October to December 2021.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Overview of review request</b>	<b>Verdict.</b>
AZ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter response was reasonable and proportionate, all the points were addressed.</p>	<b>Not Upheld</b>
BY	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>There was confusion about what statements were referred to, they did not appear to link to the complaint.</p> <p>Reviewing officer asked that allegation one being reinvestigated. Allegation two was answered in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	<b>Upheld</b>

CX	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer provided a very comprehensive response, which addressed all the points raised.</p>	Not Upheld
DW	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer provided response that addressed the points in the original email.</p>	Not Upheld.
EV	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer provided response that addressed the points in the original email.</p>	Not Upheld.
FU	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Further evidence is needed to support statements in relation to emails / telephone calls made.</p>	Upheld.
GT	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer provided a response that addressed the issues.</p>	Not Upheld

HS	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter was comprehensive and addressed all the points raised. A number of points needed to be directed to an external organisation rather than Northumbria Police.</p>	Not upheld.
IR	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed the points raised and provided rationale.</p>	Not upheld.
JQ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed the points raised and provided rationale. The complainant raised issues about other officers that could not be considered as they were not part of the original complaint.</p>	Not upheld.
KP	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>As no reports of crime had been made to Northumbria Police, it was not possible to review the incident.</p>	Not Upheld.

LO	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>This complaint was repetitive of what has been sent before.</p>	Not upheld
MN	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Further clarity needed on a number of points raised in the outcome letter</p>	Upheld.
NM	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Much of what was requested as part of the review were further questions that had not originally be part of the complaint. Recommended to submit a new complaint to cover the new questions</p>	Not Upheld
OL	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer addressed the points raised. In the spirit of transparency, to address the further points raised, clarification was requested from the Investigating Officer and this was shared with the complainant.</p>	Not upheld.

PK	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The investigation needed further work to address all the points raised.</p>	Upheld
QJ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The review request provided no grounds for a review.</p>	Not upheld.
RI	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter provide relevant legislation and addressed the reasons for arrest.</p>	Not upheld.
SH	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The points raised had been addressed by Northumbria Police in 2019. It is therefore reasonable and proportionate that Northumbria Police deemed the complaint as repetitious.</p>	Not upheld.
TG	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Not upheld

	The outcome letter clearly addressed all the points and provided sound rationale.	
UF	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed the points. However, it was slightly jargon heavy, this was raised with Northumbria Police but did not change the outcome of the complaint.</p>	Not upheld.
VE	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>In the main all points addressed. One area needed further work which was referred back to Northumbria Police</p>	Upheld.
WD	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>This relates to a case that was closed a number of years ago and information from the IMU.</p>	Not Upheld.
XC	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>This case relates to one which was first submitted in 2019 and appeal was offered at the time.</p>	Not upheld.

YB	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Further work is needed by Northumbria Police to provide evidence in relation to a number of statements made in the outcome letter.</p>	Upheld.
ZA	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed all points raised in a reasonable and proportionate manner.</p>	Not upheld.
AZ	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed all the points, with rationale for each allegation.</p>	Not upheld.
BY	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The outcome letter addressed all the points and provided rationale and details re national guidance.</p>	Not upheld
CX	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p>	Upheld.

	Further clarification should have been sought at the beginning to set direction of review.	
DW	<p>Complainant believed the outcome of their complaint was not reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>The response answered the original complaint. Further points were raised as part of the review which needed further clarification. Reviewing Officer has suggested that this be treated as a new complaint.</p>	Not upheld.