



Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel

Minutes - Wednesday 8th October 2025, FHQ Enderby

1. Welcome and Attendees:

Bethan Greasley – OPCC
Sgt Angela Cartwright – Force
Darren Goddard – Force Crime Registrar
David Findlay
Rosie Klair
Nandini Chakraborty
Ajay Aggarwall
Jenny Ardley Oakden
Nandini Chakraborty
Lisa Vine – ETP

2. Introductions and Apologies

Apologies were received from Insp Will Prince, Brigitte Heller, and Richard Chapman.

Bethan Greasley was introduced as currently covering Clare Hornbuckle's role as Assurance Officer within the OPCC during her maternity leave.

3. Urgent Business

None.

4. Action Log and Officer Feedback

Bethan Greasley (BG) provided an update on the action arising from the previous panel meeting. This action related to significant concerns about officers repeatedly misgendering a victim in a case reviewed at that meeting.

BG confirmed that she had contacted Insp Prince, who advised that both the officer in case (OIC) and the Sergeant involved had been debriefed in person and given robust feedback. Both officers were apologetic. Lisa Vine (LV) acknowledged the apology and expressed appreciation that the feedback had been taken seriously.

5. Hate Crime Statistics – Paper A

The paper was taken as read.

LV queried the data pack’s suggestion of a rise in hate crimes and asked about the evidence supporting this. Sgt Cartwright clarified that the Force typically sees a seasonal peak in hate crime during the summer months, which aligns with national trends.

6. Panel Cases for Consideration

Two cases of closed hate crimes were reviewed by the panel. The following gradings were recorded:

1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and procedures)	1
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	0
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and procedure)	1
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	0

Case ID	Classification	Rationale
Case 1		Did not review due to time constraints.
Case 2	1 – Appropriate without observation	Related to a public order offence in which an individual was racially abusive to a steward.
Case 3	3 – Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and procedure	Related to a case of potential spiking and blackmail.

Case 2 –

Action: OPCC to separate the data packs into three distinct packs for ease of reading. Each pack should include page numbers and a dedicated page for the scrutiny questions.

Panel members read through the case provided for discussion. Case related to a racially aggravated public order offence.

Jenny raised concerns about delays in the provision of CCTV evidence to the Force, which impacted the timeliness of hate crime investigations. The panel noted a potential lack of proactive engagement between the Force and external partner agencies, particularly regarding evidence sharing. It was suggested that liaison officers within these agencies should be engaged with to promote timeliness, as delays could undermine public trust in the Force’s handling of hate crime cases.

Action: Force to engage with liaison officers in relevant third-party agencies to clarify the process and timeframes for providing CCTV evidence.

David highlighted that the victim was highly complimentary of the officer handling their case. The panel commended the officer's service and noted that the documentation was prompt. All members agreed the case was appropriately handled.

Action: Force to ensure the officer receives formal feedback for the positive service provided to the victim.

David queried the use of banning orders and whether these would be attached to bail conditions. The Force clarified that they cannot issue banning orders directly but must apply for them through the courts. It was explained that bail conditions can include restrictions such as not attending certain locations, but these are temporary and differ from banning orders. It was asked how these orders are enforced; it was confirmed that enforcement of banning orders is typically carried out by spotters at events such as sports matches.

A wider discussion occurred regarding delays in the Force receiving charging decisions from the CPS. The Force confirmed that the CPS has a standard response timeframe of up to 28 days, this response may consist of a decision on whether or not to authorise charges, or a request for further information. The Force clarified that the exception is in the cases in which the Force are seeking a remand in custody. An expedited decision process applies in this instance.

The Chair then led the panel through the scrutiny questions.

The panel discussed whether the hate element was identified at the point of reporting. It was agreed that the incident was correctly recorded as racially motivated after it was queried whether the offence should have been considered religiously aggravated based on the circumstances. Victims Code of Practice (VCOP) was highlighted as completed and the victim was contacted within 24 hours and updated in line with their wishes at least every 28 days. It was identified that the Hate Crime SPOC made contact within 7 days, with victim support being offered. Supervisory oversight was evident, and the crime was correctly recorded.

Panel classified case handling as **1 appropriate without observation.**

Case 3 –

Panel members read through the case provided for discussion. Case related to blackmail and a potential spiking offence.

Nandini raised a query regarding the use of the terms 'female' and 'male' within reports, questioning whether this was the correct terminology. The Force confirmed that these terms are consistently used by the Force when referring to gender. Darren added that the Force is exploring ways to make reports more personable, including using individuals' names where appropriate instead of generic terms such as victim.

Lisa noted that the sexual orientation of the victim was not asked within the VCOP equality data monitoring, it was highlighted that it was believed this would have been prevalent to ask this question considering the hate aspect of the offence.

During the panel's review of the case, discussions were held regarding the criteria for classifying a victim as vulnerable. The panel noted that, despite the circumstances of the offence suggesting vulnerability, the victim in this instance was not formally recognised as vulnerable or intimidated. Darren clarified that the classification of a vulnerable victim or witness refers to a small specific defined group eligible for special measures. For example, victims of sexual offences are automatically entitled to enhanced rights and special measures. It was emphasised that the assessment of vulnerability does not necessarily align with a general understanding of the term. The panel also discussed the types of special measures that may be considered for victims, such as the option to provide evidence via video recording.

The panel agreed that the level of detail obtained by the Force and the documentation of the incident were lacking. It was noted that the case originated from Out of Force (OFA), meaning Leicestershire Police did not have the initial contact with the victim. The panel identified that the initial contact was insufficient; however, it was expected that Leicestershire Police should have taken steps to enhance the quality of the initial contact and improve the documentation of the incident. The panel emphasised that cases transferred from OFA should receive the same standard of service.

The Force acknowledged that the victim may not have been forthcoming, noting that the victim specifically requested the incident be logged rather than actively supported. It was recognised that this does not necessarily indicate the information was not sought, but rather that the documentation should have clearly reflected this. The Force confirmed there was no issue with the victim's preference for logging only; however, it was highlighted that there was a missed opportunity to explore the reasons behind the victim not engaging further. This could have enabled the provision of additional support. It was noted that the appropriate questions may not have been asked, or if they were, they were not adequately documented.

The Chair then led the panel through the scrutiny questions.

The hate element was not recognised at the point of initial reporting. Hate crime NICL qualifiers were not identified on the crime report or within the stats class. These were later added by the Hate Crime Team. The Force acknowledged that an incorrect initial template was used as this not include questions relating to hate crime.

The Victim's Code of Practice (VCOP) was completed. However, there were issues with the equality questions not being answered correctly or fully. The Hate Crime Officer attempted contact within the required 7-day period, and victim support services were offered. The victim wishes were also considered.

Angela highlighted the absence of a supervisory footprint on the crime report. It was noted that the OIC dealing with the case would not be authorised to file this report themselves; this would need to be completed by a Sergeant. Although the Sergeant did file the offence, no filing entry was added, which is a required action. Additionally, the incorrect filing code was used, as no investigation took place. While the offence was correctly recorded, the main issues identified were the failure to recognise the hate crime element, lack of supervisory oversight, and concerns around data quality.

Action: Sgt Angela Cartwright to provide individual case feedback to handling officers and their supervisors, informing them of the discussion and findings of the panel and requesting comment.

In view of the above, the panel classified the handling of the case as **3 inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and procedures.**

Lisa raised a general concern regarding a potential pattern in the Force's response to hate crime incidents involving LGBTQ+ victims. It was proposed that this issue be brought to the attention of the Ethics and Transparency Panel for further discussion, to determine whether additional scrutiny is required in this area.

7. AOB

None.

8. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 14th January 2026

Meeting end 20:30