

**Report of the Chief Constable to the Chair and Members  
of the Professional Standards Panel  
29<sup>th</sup> April 2010**

**Executive & Presenting Officer: Mr Derek Bonnard, Deputy Chief Constable**

**Status: For information**

## **Complaints Against Police**

### **1 Purpose**

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Complaints Against Police for the period 1<sup>st</sup> January to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010.

### **2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 That Members note the content of the attached report.

### **3 Reasons**

- 3.1 The Quarterly Progress Report on Complaint Issues for Cleveland Police for the period January to March 2010 is attached. The report is produced in this format to be National Intelligence Model (NIM) compliant.
- 3.2 There has been a 24% decrease in the number of Cases recorded during this period (108 to 82), with a 36% decrease in the number of Complaints (214 to 138).
- 3.3 When a complaint is received a file is opened known as a case. If the complainant makes several allegations these are recorded as complaints. For example, they may claim that they were assaulted during their arrest, the Officers were uncivil to them and whilst in custody they were denied access to their solicitor. This would be recorded as 1 Case with 3 Complaints attached to it – each reported under the appropriate Home Office code.

- 3.4 Complaints of 'other neglect/failure in duty' and 'incivility' continue to outnumber those of 'assault' allegations, 33 and 30 complaints respectively, compared to 21 in the 'assault' categories.
- 3.5 22% (37) of completed complaints have been locally resolved. During this period 81% (42) of locally resolved complaints have been by District and 19% (7) by PSD.
- 3.6 Locally resolved means being finalised at District/Departmental level and often involves giving advice to the Officer complained of. This is the most effective method of resolving complaints both in terms of public satisfaction and cost. Guidelines from the IPCC recommend more emphasis on 'local resolution', i.e. the Police and complainant negotiate a desired outcome, which could involve a face to face meeting with the officer or Police Staff employee complained of.

## **4 Implications**

### **4.1 Finance**

There are no finance implications to this report.

### **4.2 Diversity & Equal Opportunities**

There are no diversity or equal opportunities issues identified by the data contained within the report.

### **4.3 Human Rights Act**

There are no Human Rights Act implications arising from this report.

### **4.4 Sustainability**

There are no sustainability implications to this report.

### **4.5 Risk**

The organisation is at risk of low public confidence if complaints are not professionally resolved. The report clearly indicates that the complaints process is robust.

## **5 Conclusion**

- 5.1 There has been a decrease in the number of cases and complaints during the reporting period. Lessons continue to be learned from the complaints raised which are identified in the report.

Sean Price  
Chief Constable