



Leicestershire OPCC & Partner Agencies
Adult and Youth
Out of Court Resolutions Scrutiny Panel Meeting
Minutes

Thursday 12th September 2024 10:00-12:30

1. Welcome and Attendees:

Paul Brown – YMCA (Chair)
Clare Hornbuckle – OPCC
Marc Crisp – Insp Leicestershire Police – OOCR Lead
Barbara Filipp – Leicestershire Police
James Wells – Leicestershire Police Youth Justice
Louise Bradley – Ethics and Transparency Panel
Daniel Cunningham – Victim First
Mark Chamberlain – Criminal Justice Dept
Laura McHugh – Probation
Kayley Galway – Turning Point
Klaudia Wawrzyniak – Turning Point
Anne Cowan – Bench Chair of Leics Rutland Magistrates Bench
Carly Turner – Youth Justice
Chris Partridge – Hampton Trust

2. Apologies

Jas Purewal – Victim First
Darren Goddard – Crime Registrar
Parminder Dhillon – Insp Leicestershire Police
Amon Kotey – Magistrate
Marie Hancock – Youth Justice
Emma Hazan – Hampton Trust
Louise Cox – CPS
Lucy Watkins – CPS
Sally Cook – CPS

3. Urgent Business

a) Confirmation of Chair

Paul Brown confirmed by panel as Chair until minimum September 2026 at which point panel can nominate themselves or re-elect Paul Brown for a further period of two years.



b) Officer feedback monitoring

An update on officer feedback from March 2024 was presented to all panel members. Insp Crisp clarified that where no response was received by the officer (3 instances), Insp Crisp escalated to Chief Inspector and received acknowledgement from each, meaning all 15 cases acknowledged their feedback. No comments from panel.

c) Previous Minutes

Confirmed with panel Chair. Accurate reflection of previous meeting.

d) Force Strategic Update (Leicestershire Police)

The panel received a presentation from Insp Marc Crisp. Insp Crisp provided some context to OOCR locally, informed the board that OOCR entered the prevention directorate at a time when a HMICFRS inspection was due. This was followed by poor results in the March 2024 OOCR scrutiny panel. Insp Crisp touched a formal review undertaken on OOCRs earlier in the year, and highlighted issues found to the panel. These included minimal use of the gravity score matrix by officers, as well as ethnicity data not being properly monitored and partners receiving delayed referrals from the force. As a result of the review, objectives were identified for immediate implementation. The new team aimed to rectify each issue individually, improving the use of the gravity score matrix, enhancing APP compliance, decision making and oversight etc, and enhancing data collection and monitoring with the development of a new Power BI dashboard. Insp Crisp noted improvement across every KPI since pilot implementation. Insp Crisp concluded by stating there was still room for improvement including enhanced training, focusing the rehabilitation offer and rationalising procedures in Force. The Diversion & Youth Justice team have since expanded the pilot across the force area and are currently conducting a synergy activity to consider where amendments to current practice and structure may facilitate a more focused and strategically aligned approach.

e) Out of Court Resolutions highlight/stats report

Taken as read, no comments from panel.

f) Panel Cases for Consideration

30 cases were reviewed by the panel. 15 cases related to Adult OOCRs and 15 related to Youth OOCRs. 30% of each related to domestic incidents. The following gradings were recorded:

Adult

1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	4
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	4
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	7
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	

Youth

1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	10
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	4
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	1
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	

Case ID (Adult)	Classification	Rationale
Case A	3 – Inappropriate and inconsistent.	Possession of an offensive weapon in private place – Conditional Caution (CC) issued. Offender given condition to attend a victim awareness course however panel deemed this irrelevant and inappropriate to the offence. Condition to not commit crime for 16 weeks deemed pointless. Overall very limited conditions given circumstances. No inspector sign off.
Case B	3 – Inappropriate and inconsistent.	Common assault – CC issued. Panel felt it should have come to court. Offender asked to write a letter of apology but panel felt this was too low a requirement considering

		<p>previous offences and the fact it is an assault on an emergency worker. Turning Point felt offender could have had more significant alcohol treatment given circumstances given prev. driving disqualification. Panel felt as it is a repeat offender the OOCR was not appropriate and should have gone to court. No Victim course offered to PC victim.</p>
Case C	3 – Inappropriate and inconsistent	<p>Common assault – CC issued. Domestic incident. Magistrates felt this was a serious DV in presence of children and needed more serious intervention. Magistrates felt victim support could have been made continually available to victim. Concerns from probation about children present and intervening. CC issued despite no full and frank admission. DI authorised an Outcome 22 (voluntary referral to CARA), this individual should not have received a CC. Force to contact Senior officers and revoke CC as not protocol and not legal to issue.</p>
Case D	3 – Inappropriate and inconsistent	<p>Theft – CC issued. Magistrates felt this case could have come to court as offender had history of previous OOCRs for theft offences and the theft in relation to this offence is of a fairly high value. Value also indicates a degree of planning which would result in a low-level community order in court. Panel concerned individual could be vulnerable. There is a breach that offender hasn't attended a victim awareness course and no follow up has been done by officer in relation to this.</p>
Case E	1 – Appropriate and consistent with policy and procedure	<p>Dog causing injury – Community Resolution (CR) issued. Incident was approached by Force correctly and in line with guidance, evidence of referring to the matrix for dog bites.</p>

		Not a dangerous dog according to matrix. Course of action deemed appropriate. Fully compliant with VCOP expectations.
Case F	3 – Inappropriate and inconsistent	Assault - CR issued. Concerns from magistrates that should have come to court. Might not have intended alarm or distress but victim indicates this was caused. Previous dangerous offences recorded. Comments echoed by Magistrates. Assault offence could have come to court and previous history should have precluded individual from OOCR. Force representative indicated that a conditional caution could have been appropriate as many previous offences are historic (dating to 80s) and most recent offences are low level therefore according to guidelines, individual would have been eligible for a Conditional Caution rather than CR.
Case G	2 – Appropriate with observations.	Possession of an offensive weapon – CR issued. Individual illegally in possession of a prison officer baton (possession of offensive weapon). Comments that stronger Inspectors authority needed. Agreed by panel as appropriate with an observation.
Case H	3 – Inappropriate and inconsistent	Possession of Class A – CR issued. Concern from Magistrates on impact of witnesses as took place in public setting. Clarification that officers found drugs on individual, as individual admitted possession, CR issued with conditions. Comments that conditions were not effective in dealing with root issue for offender. Force clarified that possession of class A should be a conditional caution, indicates gravity matrix hasn't been used for offence. Should have been a CC at least, forwarded to New Dawn New Day and Turning

		Point to support with root cause of offending. Turning Point echoed this is a missed opportunity to support individual and provide health checks.
Case I	1 – Appropriate without observation	Racially aggravated public order – CC issued. Positive comments from Magistrates on the condition to attend New Dawn New Day setting out minimum number of sessions to attend.
Case J	2 – Appropriate with observations.	Public order – CC issued. Panel deemed appropriate, only comments is that no mention of gravity score matrix on decision maker’s rationale.
Case K	2 – Appropriate with observations.	Drunk and disorderly – CC issued. Magistrates comments of potential impact on witnesses and that this could have gone to court. Discussion held around warning markers noted for individual for assault on male officers – Force clarified that due to suicidal nature CMD would send any officers available regardless of gender.
Case L	3 – Inappropriate and inconsistent	Stalking/harassment – CR issued. Comments from panel on seriousness of offence, intentional breaching of bail conditions. Decision makers rationale, marked as a low level incident but doesn’t feel low level due to perpetrators repeated harassment. Force raised issue that there is a technical breach of conditions in relation to original matter and no details as to what the consequences for that were. Also highlighted that the CR is too low level for incident, no acceptance of responsibility either therefore does not actually qualify for a CR and should have been a charge. Agreed by board.
Case M	1 – Appropriate without observation.	Drug Poss – Class B – CR issued. Outcome agreed appropriate by panel due to low level nature of offence.

Case N	1 – Appropriate without observation.	Common assault – CR issued. Turning Point note concern with parent buying drugs for daughter however resolution felt appropriate.
Case O	2 – appropriate with observations.	Harassment without violence – CC issued. Magistrates queried previous convictions if they were in relation to same victims, confirmed by Force that they were, also clarified that perp had learning difficulties. Magistrates felt outcome was appropriate but concerns that this incident will only escalate given nature of circumstances. Positive feedback that gravity score matrix was considered in the rationale however no full and frank admission and prev. history. No full admission would not qualify this case for a CC.

Case ID (Youth)	Classification	Rationale
Case A	1 – appropriate without observation.	Possession of bladed article – Youth Caution (YC) issued. Clarification by Carly that YOS panel receive full and robust information about youth offender including social records. Agreed appropriate outcome by panel given circumstances.
Case B	1 – Appropriate without observation.	Non fatal strangulation – YC issued. Panel satisfied with handling and outcome.
Case C	1 – Appropriate without observation.	Harassment without fear of violence – YC issued. Panel satisfied with outcome.
Case D	2 – appropriate with observation.	Possession of an offensive weapon – YC issued. Feedback to officers that a section 18 should be completed. Panel agree outcome is good, but observations made that search was not fully compliant with guidance.

Case E	1 – Appropriate without observation.	Common assault – Youth CR issued. Comments that this is an ongoing issue but handling and outcome was reasonable and proportionate.
Case F	1 – Appropriate without observation.	Common assault – Youth CR issued. Panel felt handling and outcome was reasonable and proportionate.
Case G	2 – Appropriate with observation.	Common assault – Youth CR issued. Discussion whether NDND referral was voluntary. Concerns raised on no further support for individuals concerned and feedback for officers noted. Panel agreed outcome was appropriate but with discussed observations.
Case H	1 – Appropriate without observation.	Harassment – Youth CR issued. No supervisory footprint but proportionate outcome given circumstances. Agreed as a 1 with minor feedback for officers.
Case I	1 – Appropriate without observation.	Assault – Youth CR issued. Panel agreed reasonable and proportionate outcome.
Case J	2 - Appropriate with observations.	Possession of bladed article – Youth Caution issued. Threats to kill indicated, pre-meditated nature to scenario regarding attending school and murdering people. Missing gravity score matrix, no rationale for outcome. Individual released under investigation with no control mechanisms. Concerns from panel that comments from offender were not taken seriously. Situation could have escalated in following days. Panel feel outcome was not reasonable nor proportionate. Concern raised that no risk assessment included and no control measures. Not much reassurance that there is not a risk to public. Panel felt this could have been a youth conditional caution where measures could be put in place to provide intervention and restorative justice.

Case K	2 – appropriate with observations.	Common assault – Outcome 22 (deferred caution). Force raised that an Outcome 22 cannot be deferred in this context but that the actual outcome of the caution was appropriate. Panel clarified that work has been carried out following this case between partners to avoid repeat scenarios.
Case L	1 – appropriate without observation.	Possession of a bladed article – Youth Caution. Panel feel outcome is appropriate and proportionate.
Case M	3 – inappropriate and inconsistent.	Theft – CR issued. Panel felt this should have gone to the YOS panel. Comment that there is concern for wider family and potential facilitating of offending, noted that more could have been done to understand the wider context.
Case N	1 – appropriate without observation.	Criminal damage – Youth conditional caution issued. Panel felt outcome was reasonable and proportionate and appropriate interventions issued to offender.
Case O	1 – appropriate without observation.	Class B possession – Youth CR issued. Panel felt outcome was reasonable and proportionate, correct intervention carried out with Turning Point.

Action: Insp Crisp to provide feedback to all officers both where cases have been found to be appropriate and inappropriate informing them of outcome. This is to be tracked on the feedback monitoring spreadsheet for updating the panel in March 2025.

Action: Carly Turner to provide brief presentation at next meeting to provide context from Youth Justice.

Action: Insp Crisp to share details of Youth Case J with Carly Turner to review decision making.

g) AOB

Insp Crisp provided a brief update to the panel on Outcome 22. Insp Crisp provided an overview of the challenges and planned action for Outcome 22 including plans for deferring formal outcomes, utilising restorative justice and avoiding going through court



systems. Panel were informed that the Force are finalising papers relating to Outcome 22 and these will be shared with panel ahead of next meeting.

Action: Insp Crisp to share finalised Outcome 22 papers with Clare Hornbuckle for circulation.

h) Date of Next Meeting

13th March 2025 10am-12:30pm

Meeting closed.



CASE NO:	CASE:	DISPOSAL:	CATEGORY:	PANEL COMMENTS:
01	Case not reviewed as processed by another Force (Derbys)			
02	Stalking without fear/Assault beating (DA)	Conditional Caution	2	Needed engagement with partner agencies
03	Assault – Battery	Conditional Caution	3	Feedback to officer
04	Common Assault (DA)	Conditional Caution	3	Needed engagement with agencies
05	Assault Beating (DA)	Conditional Caution	3	Should have gone to court
06	Possession of Cannabis (Class B)	Community Resolution	1	Correct decision
07	Criminal Damage and Assault	Community Resolution	1	Correct decision
08	Criminal Damage	Community Resolution	1	Correct decision
09	Assault	Community Resolution	1	Correct decision
10	Possess Cannabis – Class B	Community Resolution	1	Correct decision
11	Criminal Damage/Harassment (without fear) DA	Conditional Caution	3	Feedback to officer



12	Assault Beating DA	Community Resolution	1	Correct decision
13	Criminal Damage/Assault (DA)	Conditional Caution	3	Feedback to officer
14	Criminal Damage	Conditional Caution	1	Correct decision
15	Harassment (without violence) DA	Conditional Caution	3	Feedback to officer