



Custody Detention Scrutiny Panel Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting	Monday 3 rd August 2026
------------------------	------------------------------------

Time of Meeting	1:00pm-3:00pm
------------------------	---------------

Location	Force HQ
-----------------	----------

PCC Contact Officer	Ms. PS
----------------------------	--------

Constabulary Contact Officer	Head of Criminal Justice & Custody
Attendees	OPCC - Ms. PS OPCC - Ms. EW Derbyshire Constabulary – EB Derbyshire Constabulary – MH Derbyshire Constabulary – Chief Inspector (CI) PS Spokesperson - JR Panel Member - LT Panel Member - LB Panel Member - CS

1. Welcome & Apologies

PS welcomed everyone to the meeting, and a brief round of introductions was done. PS also gave apologies on behalf of BM, panel member, who was unable to attend.



2. Declarations of Interest

PS asked if anyone had any declarations of interest before the meeting began - no panel members declared anything. PS explained that if during the meeting anyone realised that they did have any, then they should make it known.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

PS explained that reviewing the previous meeting's minutes during this session was challenging, as the current panel did not attend the last meeting due to the rotation system in place. Since the panels alternate attendance, the minutes were not directly applicable for discussion.

However, PS noted that all panel members receive copies of the minutes from every meeting, regardless of attendance, to ensure everyone stays informed. She therefore invited any comments or questions. The panel confirmed they had no concerns or questions to raise.

4. Review of Actions

PS informed the panel that all the actions from the previous meeting have been completed and the action log has been uploaded to the website.

SCRUTINY: Use of Force (UoF)

Before moving onto the scrutiny, PS briefly explained to the panel that the topics due to be scrutinised at the panel were UoF and Deaths in Custody however, there fortunately hadn't been any deaths in custody recently and as such, there was nothing to review regarding this topic.

With regards to UoF, prior to the meeting, JR sent PS her pre-meet report in which contained and collated all the panel members' feedback in relation to the custody records and data ahead of the meeting.

For the purpose of the minutes, all custody records and CCTV were reviewed first then followed by a discussion regarding the data provided.

5. Custody Records

CXXXXX311

Age:	15
Self-defined Ethnicity:	Not stated
Gender:	Female
Suite:	Derby
Type of force used:	Entry at 04.14 says "Force used to get her out of van" then she was restrained to the floor with leg straps as was kicking out. Was the UoF referenced at 08.26 under "medical"- "<i>Ground pin, ground restraint, handcuffs, prone restraint and other</i>" relating only to this incident? The panel felt the Custody Officer log was not specific enough about what exact UoF techniques were employed here and when. We would appreciate clarification on the specific difference between ground restraint and prone restraint, and what UoF technique might "other" refer to?
In custody or by custody:	The incident recorded occurred BEFORE and IN custody - Handcuffs rear palm out before arriving in custody noted on Risk Assessment completed 08.26, the use of leg restraints referenced in the UoF log which we think occurred as the detainee was being brought into custody, rather being applied once there. The handcuffs were removed at 02.48 (26minutes after arrival time of 02.22) but there is no record of when leg restraints removed.
Location:	Van dock and cell F9
Was everyone involved identified?	Yes x 6 plus CCTV coverage and BW video x 2 in van dock
Was everyone instructed to	Yes

complete a report of the incident?	
Were any injuries recorded?	Yes - to SGT XX, none to the detainee
Were custody records completed as soon as possible after the incident?	Completed at 04.14 following arrival in custody 02.22. Could this have been done sooner?
Did the detainee make a complaint?	No record of this
Was first aid/hospitalisation needed?	Not following or due to the UoF
Panel Conclusion	
Was the UoF appropriate?	Yes
Was there a lawful objective to use force?	Yes
Was minimum UoF used to attain objective?	Viewing CCTV and BWV of the incident would be helpful in assessing this. <i>Refer to feedback below.</i>

Record:

JR ran through the panel's findings at the meeting.

With regards to the difference between ground restraint, prone restraint, and what UoF technique "other" may refer to, MH confirmed that prone restraint is face down on the floor. This is recorded specifically because it's one of the questions looked at internally on the UoF form and officers shouldn't be keeping the detainee face down too long because of the position, possibility of asphyxia and difficulty breathing etc.

Ground restraint is a very similar method, the detainee is restrained on the ground but they will be on their back or on their side instead.

In terms of 'other' MH explained that when officers fill in the UoF form, there is a drop-down menu which states 'official techniques' i.e. handcuffing, leg restraints, gas, baton strike etc for ease when completing. If the technique used isn't an official technique, but was necessary, i.e. using force to get someone out of the back of a van, the officers should select 'other' which will then display another box for the officer to describe what force has been used.

It was clarified that for this case, all of the following "*Ground pin, ground restraint, handcuffs, prone restraint and other*" were selected as the force used. It doesn't appear though that further explanation as to what 'other' method used was described.

Moving on, JR identified that there is a log as to when the handcuffs were removed but not the leg restraints and asked if this should be recorded. MH clarified that no; there doesn't need to be a record of leg restraint removal. This is because handcuffs can cause damage to radial nerves therefore by recording when they were put on and when they were removed, it can be proved how long they were on for and whether or not nerve damage could have been caused should any complaints about this be received. Limb restraints are designed to not cause that damage. MH confirmed that the limb restraints aren't that big and can't act as tourniquets or damage nerves which is a reason as to why a record of their removal doesn't need to be made.

A discussion was had following this as JR and the other panel members didn't agree with this and believed that there should be a record of their removal. From their perspective, they need to confirm whether they believe the UoF was justified and proportionate and that they were in the restraints for the shortest time possible from a humane perspective, but they cannot establish this from the record if there is no log of when they were removed.

EB and CI PS both confirmed that the point raised is valid and it needs to be looked into.

ACTION: CI PS and EB to look into whether the removal of leg restraints needs to be recorded.

The last point raised with regards to this record was that the UoF log on the custody record was completed at 04.14 following arrival to custody at 02.22 and they asked

whether this could have been done sooner. MH firstly referred the panel members to the screen within the meeting room which displayed the CCTV and highlighted that at 02:32 the detainee can still be seen in the back of the van, in the van dock at the custody suite and no UoF had yet been used.

He then further explained that the timings on the custody record are the time in which the custody Sergeant has been able to sit down and type up the entry rather than the time in which the incident occurred. On this occasion, because the detainee was a juvenile, they needed to clear the suite before she could be booked in. She was also taken straight to the cell and searched there, due to her being violent, all of which would cause delays in completing the log on the custody record.

The panel members then reviewed the CCTV.

CCTV:

Following reviewing the CCTV, CS asked as a more general question as to whether custody has any decency blankets that can be used as the detainee was wearing a skirt which had risen during the UoF incident. MH confirmed that they don't have decency blankets in custody but assured the panel members that the suite was cleared when the detainee was being brought in so no other detainees, solicitors, health care professionals etc would've seen anything. He also pointed out that the custody Sgt did rearrange the detainees skirt to cover her when she was restrained in the cell.

To conclude this record, PS asked the volunteers if they thought the UoF was appropriate to which they confirmed it was, there was a lawful objective there and minimum force was used to attain the objective.

CXXXXX543

Age:	40
Self-defined Ethnicity:	White British



Gender:	Female
Suite:	Derby
Type of force used:	"No force used" 14.56 in risk assessment, but a two word entry at the bottom of the medical entry at 14.58 in response to the question "Was force used in custody" says "prone restraint". There is no other entry we could find in this record relating to any UoF, although we note the medical assessment at 14.52 states detainee had assaulted officers during arrest and was "volatile within custody". There was no record of handcuffs being used or removed prior to arriving or whilst in custody.
In custody or by custody:	The panel was unclear if a UoF had occurred during this detention
Location:	No record
Was everyone involved identified?	No record
Was everyone instructed to complete a report of the incident?	No record
Were any injuries recorded?	"DP injuries to legs but declined HCP" - but was seen by HCP for XXX
Were custody records completed as soon as possible after the incident?	No UoF log in record
Did the detainee make a complaint?	No record
Was first aid/hospitalisation needed?	Seen by HCP but issues not related to any UoF
Panel Decision	
Was the UoF appropriate?	"Assaulted officer on arrest, volatile in custody" but not clear if any UoF was employed at all.
Was there a lawful objective to use force?	As above



Was minimum UoF used to attain objective?	As above
--	----------

Record:

As outlined in the table above, the panel identified that there appeared to be very little information recorded regarding the UoF in this case. JR explained that the only reference the panel could find was an entry within the medical section of the custody record at 14:58 which stated "prone restraint" in response to the question asking whether force had been used in custody. She noted that elsewhere within the record there was an entry at 14:56 within the risk assessment stating that no force had been used.

JR further highlighted that the detainee had assaulted officers during the arrest and was described within the custody record as being volatile in custody, however there was no record of handcuffs being used or removed either prior to arrival or while detained in custody. The panel therefore questioned whether a UoF had actually taken place during this detention.

In response, EB explained that the record had been selected through the Constabulary's Power BI system which had flagged the detention as containing a UoF incident. Having reviewed the custody record herself, EB acknowledged that it was unclear whether the incident had been incorrectly categorised within the data or whether a UoF had taken place but had not been properly documented within the custody record. EB noted that, having reviewed the record, her findings were the same as those of the panel.

CCTV:

The panel then reviewed the CCTV footage relating to the detention.

Whilst viewing the footage, MH noted that a mattress could be seen on the floor within the cell and commented that this suggested some form of UoF had taken place prior to the detainee entering the cell.

Following viewing the footage, it did demonstrate some UoF therefore, JR made comment that this was not documented sufficiently within the custody record. JR also stated that there was no indication from the CCTV that a prone restraint had taken place, despite this being recorded within the custody record.

CI PS asked whether there was any further information/CCTV available regarding the booking in, however MH confirmed that there was not. CI PS agreed with the panel's concerns and stated that there should have been a Sergeant's detention update recorded on the custody record detailing what had occurred.

CS asked how the incident should have been categorised if the detainee had been brought into the cell in this manner. CI PS and MH explained that it would likely have been recorded as an escorted movement to a cell or under the category of "other" within the UoF recording process.

JR reiterated that the main concern from the panel's perspective was the lack of documentation. She further acknowledged that the footage shown did not include the detainee's journey from the van dock through the booking-in process. Whilst the CCTV appeared to show the detainee being placed into the cell in a manner that could be interpreted as forceful, the panel recognised that they had not seen the events leading up to this and therefore did not have the full context.

CI PS agreed and noted the importance of ensuring such incidents are properly documented. He explained that accurate recording is essential both for scrutiny purposes and for the Constabulary's own ability to understand and review what has occurred.

PS suggested that feedback should be provided to the Custody Sergeant regarding the absence of an appropriate custody record entry. CI PS agreed and confirmed that this should be raised directly with the Sergeant concerned, reiterating that the Constabulary relies upon accurate custody record entries to properly assess incidents.

ACTION: CI PS/EB to provide feedback to the Custody Sergeant regarding the lack of a UoF/detention update entry within the custody record and reinforce the requirement for accurate recording of such incidents.

To conclude this record, the panel acknowledged that the CCTV footage demonstrated that some level of force had been used. However, due to the lack of a formal UoF entry

and the limited detail contained within the custody record, the panel did not feel it was possible to fully assess the nature, necessity, or proportionality of the force used. The panel's principal concern related to the quality of the recording rather than the actions observed on the CCTV footage.

CXXXXX751

Age:	36
Self-defined Ethnicity:	Arab
Gender:	Male
Suite:	Derby
Type of force used:	Handcuffs and restraint using hand and arm control, then "searched whilst being controlled with officers controlling arms and legs" to remove outer clothing for evidential purposes. If this gentleman's legs were being controlled, was he on the ground? Were leg restraints used? The panel felt there was insufficient detail about this in the record.
In custody or by custody:	Both. In custody - handcuffs kept on after arrival at 02.20 until 04.10, and by custody "search using force" and restrained in cell by officers to remove clothing required for the investigation, then handcuffs reapplied until detainee "became more jovial and less agitated". This event was documented in UoF log at 03.52. CCTV recorded as covering the area whilst UoF used, but not being viewed during Strip Search (same event)
Location:	DR1
Was everyone involved identified?	Yes
Was everyone instructed to complete a report of the incident?	Yes
Were any injuries recorded?	Not as a result of the UoF, the detainee arrived in custody with a minor head injury

Were custody records completed as soon as possible after the incident?	Entry at 03.52, (arrival time 02.20) by Sgt XX. It is not clear at exactly what time the UoF occurred, but looking at the record, this was probably just after arrival time.
Did the detainee make a complaint?	No record
Was first aid/hospitalisation needed?	No
Panel Decision	
Was the UoF appropriate?	We believe so given the behaviour of the detainee
Was there a lawful objective to use force?	Yes- to remove clothing for evidential purposes which the detainee was not willing to do without incident
Was minimum UoF used to attain objective?	As specific details of UoF lacking, this is difficult to assess without camera footage. We appreciate the detainee's behaviour was difficult and obstructive.

Record:

JR presented the panel's findings from the pre-meet review.

Referring to the UoF recorded within the custody record, JR noted that the entry documented the use of handcuffs and restraint using hand and arm control. The record further stated that the detainee was searched whilst officers controlled his arms and legs in order to remove outer clothing for evidential purposes.

The panel queried whether the reference to officers controlling the detainee's legs indicated that he had been taken to the ground or whether leg restraints had been used. JR explained that the panel felt there was insufficient detail within the custody record to fully understand the nature of the restraint techniques used.

JR further noted that the panel considered the UoF in this case to be both "in custody" and "by custody". The detainee arrived in custody at 02:20 wearing handcuffs, which remained in place until 04:10. In addition, force was used by custody staff whilst carrying

out an evidential search and removing clothing. It appeared to the panel that these were separate uses of force which had both been recorded within the detention.

In relation to the panel's conclusions, JR explained that the panel felt the UoF appeared appropriate and lawful, as it was necessary to remove clothing for evidential purposes when the detainee was unwilling to cooperate. However, the panel had indicated that reviewing the CCTV would assist in determining whether the minimum amount of force had been used.

JR also commented positively on aspects of the custody record, noting that the detainee's epilepsy had been documented, medication had been administered where required and language support arrangements had been clearly recorded. The panel noted that an Arabic interpreter had been used and that at least one review had been conducted with the assistance of Google Translate, which they felt was well documented.

CCTV:

The panel then reviewed the CCTV footage relating to the detention.

Whilst viewing the footage, MH suggested that the references to officers controlling the detainee's arms and legs may not necessarily have related to a traditional restraint. MH noted that the detainee appeared unsteady on his feet and suggested that officers may have been supporting him to prevent him from falling or causing himself further injury, particularly given that he had arrived in custody with a head injury.

CI PS agreed that this was a possible explanation based on what could be seen on the footage.

As the CCTV continued, JR observed that the detainee appeared heavily intoxicated. She noted that after the handcuffs were removed to facilitate the evidential search, the detainee did not appear particularly resistant and often appeared unable to maintain his balance without support from officers.

MH commented that whilst force was clearly being used, it appeared to be used predominantly to manage and safeguard the detainee rather than to restrain active violence or aggression.

LT agreed that she had not observed any obvious restraint of the detainee's legs and noted that the detainee appeared largely compliant throughout the incident.

JR remarked that the detainee did not appear to be struggling significantly and that officers remained positioned either side of him during the search procedure. MH noted that the officers' positioning may itself have been preventing any struggle from developing.

A discussion then took place regarding the detainee's level of intoxication. Both JR and LT commented that the detainee appeared extremely drunk and required officers to support him throughout much of the process. LT noted that officers appeared to be holding the detainee's arms primarily because he was unsteady on his feet.

Following further review of the footage, the panel observed that no leg restraints had been used. Although the detainee was seen kicking out on occasions, the panel felt the officers' response remained proportionate and appropriate to the circumstances.

JR commented that the footage provided useful context to the written record and helped explain the references to officers controlling the detainee's arms and legs. She stated that, having viewed the footage, she felt the UoF was appropriate and did not appear excessive.

JR further noted that officers used relatively low levels of force throughout the incident, and that once the detainee was seated, only limited physical control was required. The panel agreed that this demonstrated a proportionate approach by custody staff.

To conclude this record, PS asked the panel whether they were satisfied that the UoF had been appropriate. The panel confirmed that they felt it was appropriate, proportionate and carried out for a lawful objective. Whilst the custody record could have contained greater detail regarding the specific methods of control used, the CCTV footage provided sufficient context to reassure the panel that the force used was necessary and reasonable in the circumstances. The panel were satisfied that minimum force had been used to achieve the evidential search and ensure the detainee's safety throughout the process.

CXXXXX930

Age:	39
-------------	----



Self-defined Ethnicity:	White British
Gender:	Male
Suite:	Ripley
Type of force used:	Handcuffs
In custody or by custody:	Handcuffs to front- Time of arrival 14.48, handcuffs removed 14.54
Location:	At front desk at arrival
Was everyone involved identified?	No record
Was everyone instructed to complete a report of the incident?	No record
Were any injuries recorded?	"Cuts and pain from Handcuffs"
Were custody records completed as soon as possible after the incident?	No record
Did the detainee make a complaint?	Complained verbally of being "mistreated by arresting officers"
Was first aid/hospitalisation needed?	No
Was the UoF appropriate?	Unclear
Was there a lawful objective to use force?	Unclear
Was minimum UoF used to attain objective?	Unclear: The only record of any possible UoF in this record was the use of handcuffs during arrival at the custody suite, and these were removed 6 minutes later. The panel questioned whether this really was a UoF in custody and merited inclusion in this review. We see many custody records where this timescale for removing handcuffs is similar after arriving with handcuffs on, and this is not documented as being a UoF in custody.



	However, the detainee complained about cuts and pain to his wrists caused by handcuffs, and the panel felt this could have merited a consultation with an HCP to document any injury.
--	---

Record:

JR presented the panel's findings in relation to this detention. The panel noted that the only force identified within the custody record was the use of handcuffs. The detainee arrived in custody at 14:48 and the handcuffs were removed at 14:54, approximately six minutes later.

JR explained that the panel's main query related to why this detention had been selected as a UoF case. The panel noted that many detainees arrive in custody wearing handcuffs and these cases do not ordinarily appear within their scrutiny sample. They therefore questioned whether there was another UoF incident that had not been identified within the record or whether the handcuffs had been categorised as a UoF because they remained in place after detention had been authorised.

In response, MH explained that the detainee had complained of reddening and pain to his wrists caused by the handcuffs. He advised that this was likely the reason the detention had been identified during the data extraction process and subsequently included within the scrutiny sample. MH stated that, in his opinion, the matter would not normally be considered a UoF incident in custody.

EB agreed and commented that the detention should not ordinarily have been drawn into the sample on that basis.

CI PS explained that the distinction generally relates to whether or not detention has been authorised by the Custody Sergeant. Force used prior to the detention being authorised would be considered force used before custody, whereas force used following authorisation would fall within the custody environment.

JR commented that this explanation aligned with the panel's understanding and clarified why the record had appeared unusual when compared with other detentions they had reviewed.

LT observed that this would also explain why there was no further information relating to the detainee's complaint of injury from the handcuffs, as the complaint was directed towards the arresting officers rather than custody staff.

CI PS noted that where a detainee reports injuries, he would ordinarily expect the Custody Sergeant to make an appropriate entry within the custody record documenting the concern.

JR advised that the panel had noted the entry recording cuts and pain caused by the handcuffs and had discussed whether a referral to a Healthcare Professional may have been appropriate to assess and document any injury. However, this was the only concern raised by the panel in relation to the detention.

CCTV:

The CCTV footage was reviewed by the panel.

The footage confirmed that the detainee arrived in custody wearing handcuffs and that these were subsequently removed. No further UoF was observed.

Following review of both the custody record and the CCTV footage, the panel agreed that they had not missed any additional UoF incident and that the detention appeared to have been captured within the scrutiny sample due to the detainee's complaint regarding the handcuffs rather than any UoF by custody staff.

To conclude this record, the panel were satisfied that there was no significant UoF by custody staff to scrutinise. They considered the detention to have been included within the sample due to the detainee's complaint of pain and reddening caused by handcuffs applied prior to arrival at custody. The panel noted that consideration could have been given to a Healthcare Professional assessment in relation to the reported injury, however no further concerns were identified.

Additional Records Reviewed

PS reminded the panel that six custody records had been provided in advance of the meeting. She explained that two of these had been supplied as contingency records in the event that any CCTV footage or documentation could not be reviewed during the session. Due to time constraints and the successful review of the four primary cases, PS proposed moving directly to the panel's general comments.

Before doing so, JR asked to make a brief comment regarding Case 6. She explained that, similarly to record CXXXXX930, the panel had questioned why the detention had been included within the UoF sample. JR noted that the detainee had arrived in custody wearing front stack handcuffs and that these were removed approximately 21 minutes after arrival. The panel had struggled to identify any other UoF within the record and felt the case appeared very similar to record CXXXXX930.

The attendees briefly reviewed the available footage and custody record. JR highlighted that the handcuffs had been removed at 10:43, approximately 20 minutes after arrival at the custody suite. EB noted that detention had been authorised at 10:39 and queried whether the record had been identified purely because the detainee remained handcuffed for a short period after detention had been authorised.

EB advised that she would review the issue further, explaining that it appeared possible that Niche was automatically identifying any detention where handcuffs remained in place after authorisation as a UoF in custody incident. EB commented that if this was the case, the detention may have been incorrectly included within the scrutiny sample.

JR commented that this appeared to be a likely explanation based on the information available.

EB further noted that if the data was being extracted in this way, it could have implications for the wider UoF dataset and potentially affect the accuracy of the statistics being reported. CI PS explained that the Constabulary records whether force was used before custody and whether force was used whilst in custody, however there remained some uncertainty as to exactly where the data was being drawn from.

Following discussion, EB confirmed that the matter would be reviewed further.

ACTION: EB to review how Niche and Power BI identify and extract UoF in custody records, to ensure records are being categorised and reported accurately.

The panel agreed that, based on the information available, Case 6 appeared to be similar in nature to record CXXXXX930 and raised no further concerns regarding the detention itself.

General Comments regarding the custody records:

JR referred to the panel's pre-meet report and asked how medical conditions disclosed by detainees are taken into consideration when force is used.

MH explained that officers must initially respond to the threat presented. Whilst certain medical conditions, such as heart conditions, epilepsy or severe reactions to incapacitant spray, may be recorded on Force systems and considered where relevant, officers will generally deal with the immediate risk first and any medical considerations afterwards.

Moving on, JR noted that the dedicated UoF Custody Officer Log was only present in three of the six records reviewed. The panel considered the log helpful where it had been completed, as it made it much easier to identify and understand UoF incidents. Whilst two of the records reviewed may not have been genuine UoF in custody incidents, the panel remained of the view that at least one record should have contained a dedicated UoF entry which was absent.

JR also asked whether the officer completing the UoF Custody Officer Log is always present when the incident occurs. MH explained that this is not always the case and that Custody Sergeants may complete entries based on information provided by the officers and Custody Detention Officers involved.

A discussion then took place regarding UoF reports. The panel noted that whilst custody records often state that officers have been instructed to complete UoF reports, there is currently no way for the panel to confirm whether those reports have actually been submitted.

PS suggested that, in future, the panel could ask whether the required reports had been completed, allowing the Constabulary to provide confirmation during the meeting. JR agreed that this would provide useful reassurance.



EB explained that UoF reports are specialist documents and that the panel's role is not to assess the technical legality of individual restraint techniques. However, she agreed that it would be reasonable for the panel to receive assurance that the required reports had been completed. MH added that a new process had recently been introduced to strengthen compliance with UoF reporting requirements.

The panel also commented positively on examples of good practice identified during the review. CS noted that where a dedicated UoF Custody Officer Log had been completed, the information was significantly clearer and easier to scrutinise. CI PS agreed and advised that such logs should be completed whenever required.

Finally, JR noted that whilst much of the discussion had focused on areas for improvement, the panel also wished to highlight positive practice. She explained that Case 5, although not reviewed in detail due to time constraints, had been considered a good example of clear and comprehensive documentation.

6. UoF - Figures and Statistics

General Data

The Panel reviewed custody data for the period 1st December 2025 to 28th February 2026, alongside comparative data from previous periods. The inclusion of Derbyshire demographic data from the 2021 Census was welcomed, as it provided useful contextual background, despite now being several years old.

General Data

The panel reviewed the custody data provided for the comparison periods and discussed a number of observations.

JR noted that, overall, the total number of detainees had not changed significantly between the reporting periods. Similarly, the gender breakdown and adult ethnicity profile appeared broadly consistent with previous data.

Referring to the ethnicity data, JR commented that approximately 18% of detainees were recorded as being from an ethnic minority background, compared to 13.1% of Derbyshire



residents according to the census data provided. The panel recognised that the census information was historic and that the figures were not directly comparable but felt it was worthy of comment.

EB reiterated that the Force data and census data are collected differently and therefore cannot be directly compared. She further explained that custody staff have no control over who is brought into custody and simply deal with the detainees presented to them. EB also noted that repeat detainees, visitors to the county and large events can all significantly affect the figures. She advised that disproportionality is regularly scrutinised by the Force and that further thematic reviews are undertaken where potential concerns are identified.

JR acknowledged this explanation and agreed that the panel's role was primarily to consider whether detainees are treated equally once they arrive in custody, rather than the demographics of those brought into custody.

The panel welcomed the reduction in juvenile detainees recorded during the reporting period. JR commented that this reflected what she had personally observed during custody visits, where juvenile detainees appeared to be present less frequently.

MH explained that the number of juveniles brought into custody had reduced by approximately 26%. He advised that significant work had been undertaken by the Constabulary to reduce unnecessary juvenile detentions, including additional officer training, increased use of out-of-court resolutions and enhanced scrutiny of decisions to bring children into custody.

Out of the juveniles in custody, JR noted that the data appeared to show a larger proportion of juvenile detainees from ethnic minority backgrounds. EB advised that more recent population data from Derby City indicated a significantly higher proportion of ethnic minority children within the local population than is reflected by older census data. She further explained that this work is monitored through partnership arrangements with local Youth Justice Services.



LT asked whether the reduction in juvenile detainees could be linked to the increased use of out-of-court resolutions. EB confirmed this was a significant factor and reiterated that there is now a strong presumption that children should only be brought into custody where absolutely necessary.

MH added that the average detention time for juveniles is approximately six hours and highlighted that the types of offences for which children are brought into custody are generally more serious than in previous years.

Turning to the UoF data, JR noted that there appeared to be a slight increase in the proportion of detainees from Black or Asian backgrounds who had been subject to force between the two reporting periods. The panel also observed that, despite the overall reduction in juvenile detainees, the number of juveniles subject to force remained unchanged.

EB advised that she was unable to comment on those figures in detail during the meeting but agreed to review the data further.

ACTION: EB to review the apparent increase in detainees from Black or Asian backgrounds who were subject to UoF and report back on any findings.

ACTION: EB to review the juvenile UoF data to establish whether the figures relate to a small number of repeat detainees or indicate another trend requiring further analysis.

The panel further noted that a greater number of specific force categories appeared to have been recorded during the later reporting period. JR suggested that this may be because multiple force types can be recorded against a single incident, resulting in higher overall totals. EB agreed that this was likely to be the case.

The panel also briefly discussed the data relating to interpreters and offence types but acknowledged that these areas fell outside the main scope of the current scrutiny topic.



Finally, the panel welcomed the confirmation that there had been no deaths in custody during the reporting period.

7. All topics - HMIC Recommendations and Force Progress.

The panel members were provided with the HMICFRS recommendations from the last inspection in 2018 prior to the meeting and an update as to where the Constabulary are at now.

PS explained that there was no update to give on this as there has not been a new inspection since the panel looked at them last year. The panel was asked whether they had any comments regarding the documents provided, but no issues were raised.

8. Any other business

PS asked if the panel had any other business.

JR took the opportunity to provide feedback on the CDSP process from the perspective of her panel group.

Firstly, JR thanked EB for the data provided throughout the lifespan of the panel, commenting that the quality and level of detail had improved significantly over the last two years and had provided the panel with much more meaningful information to scrutinise.

She further stated that the panel felt there was value in continuing to review the same scrutiny topics, as this allows trends, improvements and changes over time to be identified. PS acknowledged this point and confirmed it would be considered as part of the wider review of the panel.

JR further commented that whilst the Constabulary and OPCC had been open and helpful in sharing information, the panel were unclear on what changes or improvements had resulted directly from issues raised by the CDSP. She suggested it would be beneficial

for panel members to receive feedback on outcomes arising from the scrutiny process in order to demonstrate its impact.

PS explained that this was something already being considered as part of the review of the panel and referred to the importance of strengthening the feedback loop. She advised that introducing a method of recording and tracking outcomes, potentially through a RAG (red, amber, green)-rated action tracker, was one option being explored.

EB advised that consideration also needed to be given to how the various custody scrutiny processes could be streamlined. She explained that there are currently several different scrutiny panels and governance groups reviewing aspects of custody, often with similar objectives but using different approaches. EB suggested that a more structured process could reduce duplication and provide greater consistency in scrutiny activity.

A discussion followed regarding the purpose of external scrutiny. EB explained that, in her view, the CDSP should act as an external quality assurance process, providing independent validation of the conclusions reached through the Constabulary's own internal scrutiny arrangements. JR agreed this approach seemed sensible and would help demonstrate whether internal and external scrutiny were reaching similar conclusions.

PS acknowledged the points raised and advised that all feedback received would be considered as part of the ongoing review of the panel. She noted that any future model would need to balance the information requested by panel members against the resources available within both the OPCC and the Constabulary to support the process.

JR asked whether the review was being undertaken because CDSPs may become mandatory in the future. PS explained that the original guidance strongly encouraged all Forces to establish a CDSP and, whilst no formal requirement currently exists, it was reasonable to anticipate that the process may become mandatory in the future.

PS further explained that Derbyshire's approach is already more detailed than that adopted by many other Forces, combining custody record reviews, thematic scrutiny, data analysis and consideration of HMICFRS recommendations within a single process.

LT asked whether further CDSP meetings would take place whilst the review was ongoing. PS explained that, having completed two years of the current process and reviewed all agreed scrutiny topics across both volunteer groups, this was considered an appropriate point to pause meetings while the review was undertaken. She advised that no further meetings had been scheduled at this time.

EB added that the intention was not to create a lengthy delay, but to use the coming months to complete the review, consider any changes to governance arrangements and streamline processes where possible. It was anticipated that internal discussions would take place throughout the remainder of the year, with the aim of launching a refreshed process thereafter.

PS asked whether there was any further business to discuss. No further matters were raised and the meeting concluded.

Next Meeting: TBC