

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 – January and March 2024.

| Name | Overview of review request | Verdict. |
|--------------|---|-----------------|
| <i>Jan 1</i> | No complaint submitted to allow a review to be undertaken. | Not valid |
| <i>Jan 2</i> | Form sent for further information | Not valid |
| <i>PQ</i> | The Investigating Officer provided a full response, with rationale to the allegations. | Not upheld. |
| <i>Jan 4</i> | Correct date for review submission provided. | Not valid |
| <i>Jan 5</i> | Information provided relates to a complaint submitted 16 years ago. | Not valid |
| <i>Jan 6</i> | Extension given to review date, request not submitted. Recontact from the complainant five months later. | Not valid. |
| <i>QR</i> | Northumbria Police addressed the complaint in a reasonable and proportionate manner and offered an apology. | Not upheld. |
| <i>RS</i> | The complaint was fully addressed following the review of BWV, which supported the actions of the officer. | Not upheld |

| | | |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>ST</i> | The outcome letter recognised that the email should have had more detail, this was provided in the outcome letter. | Not upheld. |
| <i>TU</i> | Further work needed in relation to contacting a witness to a telephone call. | Upheld. |
| <i>UV</i> | Clarification needed on a number of points. | Upheld. |
| <i>VW</i> | The outcome letter addressed all the points raised. The quality of the letter was not to a standard which was clear to understand. | Not upheld. |
| <i>WX</i> | The outcome letter was very comprehensive and addressed all the points raised. | Not upheld. |
| <i>XY</i> | The outcome letter addressed all the points raised. | Not upheld. |
| <i>YZ</i> | Further information was needed as part of the review process. | Upheld. |
| <i>Feb 6 -</i> | Review request out of time (four months late) | Not valid. |
| <i>ZA</i> | The response addressed all points raised in a reasonable and proportionate manner | Not upheld. |
| <i>AB</i> | The outcome response was reasonable and proportionate. | Not upheld. |
| <i>BC</i> | Further information and rationale is needed to support statements. | Upheld. |
| <i>CD</i> | The response fully addressed the error that occurred and the actions taken to resolve the matter. | Not upheld |
| <i>DE</i> | The outcome letter addressed the points raised. | Not upheld. |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-------------|
| <i>EF</i> | The outcome letter addressed the points raised. | Not upheld. |
| <i>FG</i> | Further clarification needed re correspondence that was provided to Northumbria Police. | Upheld. |
| <i>GH</i> | The original questions referred to in the complaint were not answered. | Upheld. |
| <i>HI</i> | The outcome letter was very comprehensive and covered all allegations. | Not upheld. |
| <i>IJ</i> | One part of the complaint had not been addressed. | Upheld. |
| <i>JK</i> | The outcome letter addressed all points, with rationale provided. | Not upheld. |
| <i>KL</i> | The outcome letter referred to relevant legislation as to why matters would not progress. | Not upheld |
| | | |