

Leicestershire OPCC & Partner Agencies
Youth - Out of Court Resolution Scrutiny Panel

Minutes - Thursday 13th March 2025

1. Welcome and Attendees:

Paul Brown – YMCA (Chair)
Clare Hornbuckle – OPCC
Insp Marc Crisp – Leicestershire Police
Sgt James Wells – Leicestershire Police (Youth Justice)
Elena Williams – Leicestershire Police
Andy Collins – Leicestershire Police
Ben Broad – Youth Justice Leicestershire Police
Anne Cowan – Bench Chair Leicester Magistrates
Carly Turner – Youth Justice
Claudia Wawrzyniak – Turning Point Criminal Justice Manager
Louise Bradley – Ethics and Transparency Panel
Marianne Connally - CPS
Daniel Cunningham – Victim First Restorative Justice Lead
Alison Chick - Youth Bench Chair, Leicestershire and Rutland
Holly Vickers – OPCC Administrator

2. Apologies

Darren Goddard, Kayley Galway, Sally Cook, Graeme Baxter, Amy Perry-Granger, Supt Matt Ditcher, Amon Kotey

3. Urgent Business

The Chair gave an overview of the proposed new panel structure which would take the meetings from two per year in which 30 cases are reviewed in each, to four meetings per year in which 15 are reviewed each time, focusing on either adult or youth OOCRs. Carly Turner stated her support for the new structure, noting that she understood the time and demand pressure of producing 30 cases per meeting.

Anne Cowan also noted that she was supportive, echoing that this would be less demanding for those doing the preparational work and that the frequent reviewing should ensure timely responses and feedback on areas of improvement.

Insp Marc Crisp summarised that this will give each panel a lot more focus and allow membership at appropriate panels, noting that members may choose to attend adult or youth panels depending on their area of expertise.

The proposed structure has therefore been agreed with support from the panel and will run quarterly alternating adult and youth. This will start in September 2025 with the review of 15 adult cases (30% domestic).

4. Officer Feedback

Insp Crisp updated the panel on officer feedback from the September 2024 panel, stating that it was largely positively received and accepting across the board. Insp Crisp noted push back on one case as feedback went to an officer who was not the OIC for the case. Insp Crisp advised that the area Sergeant acknowledged feedback regardless.

5. Update from Youth Justice – Carly Turner

The panel received an update on the OOCR process from Carly Turner on the Youth Justice process to give context to panel on how they work alongside the Force.

Insp Crisp added there has been a real focus around child centred policing and this will shape what the OOCR team do now and their agreements between partnerships to improve outcomes for children. Insp Crisp stated that it was important that the picture of data is understood and fed into interventions between partnerships and that children are being diverted from prosecution appropriately.

Action: Carly to circulate slides with wider panel.

6. Panel Cases for Consideration

15 youth cases were reviewed by the panel. The following gradings were recorded:

1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	5
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	6
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	4
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	0

Case Number	Classification	Rationale
Case A	2 (appropriate with observations)	Drug possession Class B – Community Resolution. Insp Crisp highlighted that there should have been rationale provided as to whether or not a strip search was appropriate however overall handling was appropriate. Conditions stipulated self-referral to Turning Point however should have been referred by Police.

Case B	2 (appropriate with observations)	Common assault – Community resolution. Carly noted that girls are over-represented for violent offences so any diversion opportunities are welcomed from youth justice. No PPN completed and no additional support considered.
Case C	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with Force/CPS policy and/or procedure)	Racially aggravated public order – Community Resolution. Paul initially raised concern on the racist language used within. Carly noted no educational intervention for the youth, a prevent referral could have been beneficial to the child for their development. Marianne echoed comments and noted that often these attitudes stem from learning and wider work could have been undertaken with both child and family to re-educate. Insp Crisp discussed several failings from Police perspective, officers should have managed the incident there and then with educational input, there was a proportional way this could have been dealt with. Extremely poor service provided. Regarding outcomes for hate crimes, Out of Court Resolutions are not appropriate based on prosecution rules. There is a way around if it can be applied for with conditions that are beneficial however this was not done on this occasion, plus no interview was carried out by officers. Insp Crisp to carry out feedback face to face due to gravity of situation.
Case D	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with Force/CPS policy and/or procedure)	Taking a motor vehicle without the owner’s consent – Community Resolution. Marianne raised concern about how the Force could enforce a curfew-based condition. Number of offences such as no license, no insurance attached and therefore suggested this could have come to court. Insp Crisp noted a service level agreement is currently going through where low-level traffic offences for youths can be sent for project BRAKE intervention both pre and post

		<p>charge. Carly noted this felt a punitive outcome and there could be underlying issues between mother and son, echoed a curfew is redundant as no education to prevent reoccurring. Paul also noted lack of consideration of risk to public. Insp Crisp also added no safeguarding report completed and echoed Paul's comments on risk to public safety. No rationale from supervisor. No evidence of Traffic Offence Report (TOR). Little local authority involvement prior to this matter, missed opportunity to divert child at much earlier stage. Carly added no context on whether this offence was in a public space.</p>
Case E	2 (appropriate with observations)	<p>Assault – Deferred Youth Caution. Marianne noted there could be public interest to pursue this as domestic abuse. Insp Crisp noted agreement but that it was handled proportionally for the case.</p>
Case F	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with policies and procedures)	<p>Sexual assault on a female – Outcome 22 (NFA, words of advice). Marianne noted it doesn't appear to have an admission of an offence. Potential wider work to be done in terms of harmful sexual behaviour, no note of families understanding of behaviour either. Paul also noted lack of information regarding perpetrator's mental capacity. Carly notes use of language in report and the term 'chat' used in report indicates lack of structure and suggests informality. Seeing increase in sexual harm in county and notes that it is unclear whether any intervention work was included as a result of offence. Alison noted that words of advice does not sound sufficient for gravity of offence. Insp Crisp noted the difficulty is no context and poor rationale attached to case. Significant complex issues present. No safeguarding report done at initial point and echoed that words of advice is poor practice and is not an</p>

		'outcome 22'. Outcome 22s should be heavily structured and delivered formally to child, a 'chat' is not appropriate. Ben added concern regarding lack of structure with this case. Louise added concern about intervention provided to victim and family as not cited within the report. Insp Crisp noted that the individual was already under social care. [Carly checking process during meeting]
Case G	2 (appropriate with observations)	Malicious comms – Outcome 22. Insp Crisp noted that the general approach of officers was proportionate, however noted the use of an outcome 22 which did not include enough detail on the intervention, for example no note of what the discussion with the perpetrator involved which should be structured and formally delivered. Daniel noted no note of intervention for the perpetrator, Insp Crisp agreed but noted issues that it is not possible to enforce.
Case H	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	Attempt to choke/suffocate - Youth Conditional Caution. Paul queried the concerning language within that indicates an escalation of thoughts to actions with regards to violent thoughts with child. Elena noted long discussions on this case at the youth justice panel, citing previous instances with the same perpetrator. However, case was all handled appropriately and proportionately.
Case I	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	Assault by beating - Community resolution. Insp Crisp noted this was well handled and right outcome for case.
Case J	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	Drug possession Class B – Community Resolution. Carly noted this felt the right outcome for the case with the referral to turning point. Louise noted Child Exploitation element of case and what provisions were in place. Insp Crisp advised that PPNs were submitted and correct authorities notified of perpetrator.

Case K	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	Assault – Community Resolution. Panel noted a good example of officer conduct.
Case L	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with Force/CPS policies and/or procedure).	Public Order – Community Resolution. Carly noted that the resolution felt like a problem management process for the incident there and then but conditions were redundant long term. Noted that this should have come through the youth panel for proper review. Noted a lack of intervention in light of the significant language used by perpetrator. Marianne noted significant previous conditions and intervention in past and behaviour still prevalent. Insp Crisp noted an F7 could have been utilised.
Case M	2 (appropriate with observations)	Assault – Community Resolution. Carly queried lack of detail on who has directed the engagement with intervention. Ben noted that as this came to a youth offending service panel it would have had a footprint from partnership services. Insp Crisp noted that the context of this offence and biological hazard within are particularly offensive and potentially traumatic for victim. Elena noted no formal complaint from victim at the YOS panel which is why further interventions were not given to perpetrator.
Case N	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	Theft – Community Resolution. Carly queried whether the letter of apology to victim was actioned, confirmed by Insp Crisp. Carly noted an observation in terms of RJ that the letter of apology timescale could have been outlined, important that it is timely in relation to the offence. Overall a good outcome. Daniel noted concern with writing letters, stating that there is sometimes not enough support for perpetrator in writing appropriate letters and not including language that will retraumatize victim. Paul queried process of letter writing to victims. Insp Crisp confirmed officers screen letters to check appropriate content and

		echoed Daniel's point that in past letters have been poor or guidance has not been stringent enough.
Case O	2 (appropriate with observation)	Drug possession – Class B. Community Resolution. Carly noted condition of referral to turning point felt appropriate. Panel noted concern at wider context of case as there is mention of TPAC of vehicle, then firearms search which led to finding of cannabis. Panel noted concern at potential wider missing elements and missing rationale in relation to the triage decision that resulted in a CR in this case.

Alison Chick queried the selection process for the cases for the panel as there is a significant number of young children in OOCR cases. Marc confirmed these were selected completely at random and the only consideration to be made is ensuring 30% domestic.

Action: Insp Crisp to provide feedback to all officers whose cases were reviewed. This includes both positive feedback and areas for improvement.

Action: James Wells to scrutinise rationale around case O and feedback.

Action: Carly to receive details of cases in advance of panels to bring further context from youth justice to each.

7. AOB

8. Date of Next Meeting

11th September 2025 10am-12:00pm

Meeting closed.