

From the 1st 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).

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 2023.

Name	Overview of review request	Verdict.
<i>UV</i>	The compliant was responded to in a reasonable and proportionate manner, one point of clarification needed.	Not upheld
<i>VW</i>	Northumbria Police recognised the shortfall in conversation. One point needed clarification	Not upheld. Recommendations
<i>WX</i>	Complainant asked to be contacted to discuss complaint, this was not actioned.	Upheld.
<i>XY</i>	The outcome letter addressed all the points raised and provided rationale.	Not upheld.
<i>YZ</i>	Investigating Officer asked that Northumbria Police look at the final determination given to a complaint	Upheld.
<i>ZA</i>	The Officer subject to the complaint should provide a statement to address the concerns raised.	Upheld.
<i>AB</i>	Further clarification is needed in relation to several points.	Upheld,
<i>BC</i>	The outcome letter provides rationale and further information. Two small	Not upheld.

	points of clarification requested – this would not change outcome of review.	
<i>CD</i>	The outcome letter addressed all the points raised, where the complaints were about non-police staff, the IO advised how to progress.	Not upheld.
<i>DE</i>	The outcome was ‘unable to determine’ this was the correct outcome, as there was no evidence to support one side or the other.	Not upheld.
<i>EF</i>	This was specific to one allegation which was previously upheld. The Investigating Officer has fully addressed the points raised.	Not upheld.
<i>FG</i>	The complaint was fully addressed. New points raised as part of review could not be addressed as they were not part of the original complaint.	Not upheld.
<i>GH</i>	The 101 call was recorded and provided that the allegations made were not a reflected in the complaint.	Not upheld.
<i>HI</i>	Further clarification is needed regarding a number of points and statements made.	Upheld
<i>IJ</i>	Two parts of the original complaint not referred to. Further clarification needed regarding final outcome letter.	Upheld
<i>JK</i>	Allegation one needs further work to address the points raised.	Upheld
<i>KL</i>	All points addressed, rationale provided as to why fuller details could not be provided.	Not upheld.
<i>LM</i>	Issues raised are a new complaint.	Not Upheld.
<i>MN</i>	The Reviewing Office has requested an explanation as to how the	Not Upheld.

	Investigating Officer made their decision in light of comments made as part of the investigation.	
<i>NO</i>	At this present time the police complaints system was not the appropriate process as the matter was being dealt with via another legal institution.	Not upheld
<i>OP</i>	The outcome letter fully addressed all points. A few issues raised in the review request did not link to the complaint.	Not upheld
<i>PQ</i>	The outcome letter provided a response that addressed the specific concerns raised in the allegation. One point from the original complaint was referred to PSD to progress.	Not upheld
<i>QR</i>	The outcome letter provided a response that addressed the specific concerns raised in the allegation.	Not upheld.
<i>RS</i>	A comprehensive outcome letter was provided, that addressed all the points with rationale.	Not upheld
<i>ST</i>	The outcome letter addressed all the points raised.	Not upheld.
<i>TU</i>	PSD obtained advice from relevant department to ensure correct advice was correct.	Not upheld