

**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 – April to June 2024.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Overview of review request</b>	<b>Verdict.</b>
<i>A</i>	The outcome letter addressed all three questions, providing rationale and further information.	Not upheld.
<i>B</i>	The outcome letter addressed all five allegations and provided sound rationale.	Not upheld.
<i>C</i>	The outcome letter addressed the specific points that were requested from a previous upheld complaint.	Not upheld.
<i>D</i>	The outcome letter addressed the specific points that were raised with rationale provided.	Not upheld.
<i>E</i>	The response letter did not address the allegations in a reasonable and proportionate manner. Recommended that allegations 1,2,3 and 4 are reinvestigated.	Upheld.
<i>F</i>	The response letter addressed the main parts of the complaint. One element was not addressed, referred to PSD to respond.	Not upheld

<i>G</i>	No invite to meet Investigating Officer, so complainant could not share evidence.	Upheld
<i>H</i>	The outcome letter addressed the specific points raised and the comments were supported by body worn	Not upheld.
<i>I</i>	The outcome letter needed further rationale and clarification on the policies considered.	Upheld.
<i>J</i>	The outcome letter addressed most points raised. One point was omitted, and this was referred back to PSD.	Not upheld
<i>K</i>	The outcome letter addressed all the points raised and offered appropriate apologies.	Not upheld.
<i>L</i>	The outcome letter addressed all the points raised.	Not upheld.
<i>M</i>	The outcome letter addressed all the points raised and provided rationale.	Not upheld.
<i>N</i>	Further clarification is needed on several points	Upheld.
<i>O</i>	The outcome letter addressed the allegation, but one part of the complaint was not considered	Referred to PSD
<i>P</i>	The outcome letter addressed the two allegations and provided sound rationale.	Not upheld.
<i>Q</i>	The outcome letter addressed the eight allegations.	Not upheld
<i>R</i>	The outcome letter addressed the allegations, an apology was offered	Not upheld.
<i>S</i>	The outcome letter fully addressed the issues raised	Not upheld.

<i>T</i>	The outcome letter recognised the shortfall in service and how improvements could have been made.	Not upheld.
<i>U</i>	The outcome letter recognised the shortfall in service, two recommendations have been made.	Not upheld.
<i>V</i>	The outcome letter needed further work and rationale.	Upheld.
<i>W</i>	Overall the outcome letter was reasonable and proportionate, but to provide a better understanding to the complainant further points were asked to be addressed.	Recommendations.
<i>X</i>	The outcome letter fully addressed the issues raised	Not upheld.
<i>Y</i>	The outcome letter fully addressed the issues raised	Not upheld.
<i>Z</i>	The outcome letter fully addressed the issues raised	Not upheld,