



**Leicestershire  
Police**  
Protecting our communities

**Leicestershire Police & Partner Agencies**  
**Youth Out-of-Court Scrutiny Panel**  
**Minutes**

**13<sup>th</sup> January 2016**

**1. Attendance & Apologies**

<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Apologies</b>
Paul Stock (PS) – Chair – Chief Executive OPCC	Clare Weddell (CW) – Women’s Aid
John Norman (JN) – Police	
D/Supt David Sandall (DS) - Police	
Nigel Chapman (NC) CPS	
Hiliary Alton (HA) - HMCTS	
Andy Cooke (AC) – Deputy Youth Bench Chair	
Mark Verran (MV) – Team Manager, Leicester YOS	
John Freeman (JF) – Youth Panel	
Tracy Green (TG) – Youth Panel	
Caroline Barker (CB) – Police	

**2. Minutes & Actions from October 2015 meeting**

Minutes of the last meeting were agreed as a correct record and actions were reviewed.

- 2.1 JN explained the background and purpose of the meeting for the benefit of those who had not previously attended. It is a national requirement to have a multi-agency scrutiny panel to look at the way the police deal with cases by way of an out of court disposal as opposed to prosecution. Sample cases are reviewed to see if they have been dealt with appropriately and learning points can be fed back and incorporated into future training for officers.

**3. October 2015 Report**

- 3.1 An overview of the report circulated prior to the meeting was provided by JN and he distributed a further paper at the meeting relating to comparative

performance figures for Youth Out of Court Disposals Jul-Dec 2015. JN explained that there had been a reduction in the overall number of disposals. NC asked if there could be a breakdown of conditional caution figures.

- 2.2 **ACTION:** CB to speak with the analysts to see how they are obtaining the youth offending data from Niche.
- 2.3 PS explained the selection process to the Panel and that all cases are randomly selected by the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- 2.4 PS said that reoffending rates have improved with the use of cautions rather than reprimands and final warnings. TG advised that YOS follow a cohort each year to assess reoffending. PS said that this could be an agenda item for the July meeting. AC commented that reoffending

**ACTION:** JN to liaise with YOS to obtain reoffending data

#### 4. January 2016 Panel Cases for Consideration

- 4.1 Fifteen cases chosen at random by the OPCC were reviewed by the Panel. Of the 15 cases there were:

- 1 x Possession an Offensive Weapon
- 1 x Section 5 Public Order
- 1 x Indecent Assault
- 1 x DV related Criminal Damage
- 1 x Possession of Indecent images and Possession of extreme pornography
- 4 x Damage
- 2 x Common Assault (Battery)
- 1 x Common Assault
- 3 x Theft from Store

- 4.2 The panel findings for the 15 cases were as follows:
  - 12 cases were deemed "Appropriate and consistent with Police policies / the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors."
  - 3 cases were deemed "Appropriate with observations."
  - No cases were deemed "Inappropriate and inconsistent with policy."

## 4.3 A breakdown of the offences, disposals and findings is as below:

Case No:	January 2016 Panel	Disposal	Panel Findings & Comments	Category
01	Criminal Damage	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate and consistent	1
02	Common Assault	Youth Caution	Appropriate and consistent	1
03	Possession of Indecent images and Possession of extreme pornography	Youth Conditional Caution	Appropriate with observations	2
04	DV related Criminal Damage	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate and consistent	1
05	Criminal Damage	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate with observations	2
06	Common Assault (Battery)	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate and consistent	1
07	Indecent Assault	Youth Conditional Caution	Appropriate and consistent	1
08	Theft from store	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate and consistent	1
09	Theft from store	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate and consistent	1
10	Criminal Damage	Youth Caution	Appropriate and consistent	1
11	Theft from store	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate and consistent	1
12	Possess an offensive weapon	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate and consistent	1
13	S.5 Public Order	Youth Caution	Appropriate with observations	2
14	Common Assault (Battery)	Youth Caution	Appropriate and consistent	1
15	Criminal Damage	Youth Community Resolution	Appropriate and consistent	1

4.4 There were no cases deemed *“Inappropriate and Inconsistent with Policy”*.

4.5 In the first case deemed *“Appropriate but with observations”* [#3], the offender received a conditional caution and the Panel would have preferred this to go to court due to the serious nature of the offence of possession of indecent images and possession of extreme pornography. Panel members felt that a charge and a referral order may have been a better outcome. Part

of the mitigation was that the offender suffered from Asperger’s and the panel believe this should have been explored further to fully understand how this may have impacted on the offending behaviour.

- 4.6 **ACTION:** JN to supply the URN for this case to NC – completed
- 4.7 In the second case deemed “*Appropriate but with observations*” [#5], the offender received a community resolution and the Panel felt that a follow up referral to YOS for the offender to receive support would have been appropriate.
- 4.8 In the third case deemed “*Appropriate but with observations*” [#13], the offender received a caution for a public order offence. The Panel were impressed with the rationale recorded by the police decision maker who challenged the initial YOS decision to issue a community resolution. On review YOS agreed with the challenge and said that a caution should be given. The Panel would have preferred for a conditional caution to be given.
- 4.9 With regard to the cases deemed “*Appropriate and Consistent*”, the following observations were made:-

#1	Damage. Appropriate as no offending history.
#2	Common Assault (Battery). Considered appropriate.
#4	DV related Criminal Damage. Appropriate as no offending history. And appropriate referrals made to address offending behaviour.
#6	Common Assault (Battery). Considered appropriate and school have put interventions in place to address offending behaviour.
#7	Indecent Assault. Appropriate conditions attached to manage offending behaviour.
#8	Theft from Store. Remorse shown and appropriate outcome.
#9	Theft from Store. Appropriate, but life time ban from store as a condition of Community Resolution considered disproportionate by Panel. Shops are entitled to do this but the police should not include a ban of this duration for a young offender.
#10	Criminal Damage. Appropriate disposal with intervention in place.
#11	Theft from store. Appropriate as no offending history.
#12	Possess an offensive weapon. Appropriate as no offending history.
#14	Common Assault (Battery). Appropriate outcome, the offender has engaged well with support in place. The Panel did comment that the views of the victim would have been helpful but none were recorded.
#15	Damage. The offender carried out work at the offence location as reparation for their offending.

- 4.10 There were no cases where the Panel failed to reach a conclusion.

**5. Communication**

- 5.1 The Panel agreed it would be beneficial for the Scrutiny Panel minutes to be shared with Youth Panel members.

**6. Any Other Business**

- 7.1 PS advised that there was to be a seminar on 29<sup>th</sup> February to which prospective PCC candidates were to be invited to help them understand the role partners play in the work of the PCC. PS invited panel members to attend to ensure candidates are aware of the importance of the panel work and the need for it to continue.

**7. Date of Next Meeting**

- 7.1 The next Youth OOCB Scrutiny Panel will take place in April 2016.