

Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel

Minutes - Wednesday 24th June 2026, FHQ Enderby

1. Attendees & Introductions

David Findlay	– Chair
Letitia Thomas	– OPCC admin
Clare Hornbuckle	– OPCC Assurance Officer
Sgt Angela Cartwright	– Force
Jemma Connor-Iommi	– Force
Darren Goddard	– Crime Registrar
Lisa Vine	– Ethics & Transparency Panel
Ajay Aggarwall	– Panel Member
Rosie Klair	
Richard Chapman	

2. Apologies

Jen Oakden, Nandini Chakraborty, Barbara Czyznikowska

3. Urgent Business

David announces he will be stepping down from the panel after volunteering for the Force since 2014. The panel notes their thanks for his support as Chair. Election of a new Chair will be deferred due to absences.

ACTION – Panel members to consider a new chair in preparation for the next meeting

The OPCC will be carrying out appraisals over Microsoft Teams. They will be sending out invitations in the following days.

4. Action Log and Officer Feedback

Action 23 Case feedback – the OICs involved are on maternity leave. Feedback was provided to the AIU officer involved in Case B and this was taken on board.

5. Panel Cases for Consideration

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

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

Case ID	Classification	Rationale
Case 1	3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and procedure)	Public order case involving assault with aggravating factors. The case was closed without conviction due to variation in the type of assault reported and a lack of other evidence (the CCTV footage was described as not recording the offence). The panel question this due to the nature of the location where the offence took place. The suspect was assessed as having capacity to understand and control their actions, but this assessment was documented for an earlier offence and used again. The panel question whether the suspect would have had capacity at the time of this offence and note how the acquired capacity for the voluntary interview. The Force believe this is something that should have been picked up by the sergeant. The panel discuss if the assault was recorded correctly as it is only mentioned in some parts. The assault was recorded separately from the public order offence as it occurred at a different time, but this is not made very clear in the reports. The force clarify that the victim did not perceive the offence as a hate crime, but the officer still correctly recorded it as a hate crime. The force determined this case needs to be reopened. The conflicting statements for what the assault was

		does not negate that there was an assault. The panel discuss that the lack of conviction led to further cases with the same suspect and question the impact on the care staff involved. This could have been recorded as harassment. OFFICER FEEDBACK – Officers to be informed that confirmation of capacity - when needed - needs to be obtained for the time of the offence. ACTION – Rosie to send Angela a list of mental health units in LLR. ACTION - Dip sample 10-20 offences in mental health units to see if this outcome is a common occurrence. Ensure to record metrics like case outcome and gender.
Case 2	2 (Appropriate but with observations)	Common assault. No suspect was identified. The panel discuss inconsistencies regarding how the medical issues of the victim were recorded. The panel question how neighbourhood police are made aware of cases like this as it seems local officers could have helped to identify suspects. This wasn't flagged as Anti-social behaviour, but neighbourhood police are usually aware as they monitor local crime logs. It may be important that cases like this are directly brought to the attention of the local beat officers. The panel discuss that the victim stated they recognised the group and potentially the suspect, but it is unclear how thoroughly this was investigated. The force add it doesn't seem CCTV or Ring doorbells were checked. They question if the investigation was detailed enough or recorded thoroughly enough. The panel note the recorded location of the incident varies, making it unclear where the offence took place. The panel reflect the locations should be documented clearly even if the victim or suspect moved around. The panel believe the investigation plan was not correct. FEEDBACK – the panel note the care and attention given to recognising the vulnerabilities of the victim. NEW ACTION – the force will listen to the call made by the force to the victim to establish how thorough the

		investigation was and gain clarifications on the issues in the reports.
--	--	---

Case A –

In view of the above, the panel classified the handling of the case as **Grade 3**

Case B –

In view of the above, the panel classified the handling of the case as **Grade 2**

NEW ACTION - Angela to provide individual case feedback to handling officers via Email with OPCC cc'd. Case feedback to go to handling officers and their supervisors informing them of the discussion and findings of the panel and requesting comment.

6. Any Other Business (AOB)

The panel note their appreciation for the force members that attend the panel. They are always engaged and willing to further investigate the cases in the meetings or bring more information to following meetings.

The OPCC have reflected that to increase validity of findings, more cases need to be reviewed in a year. The OPCC presented a proposed format change to cases, focusing on a detailed summary with access to appendices if needed. The OPCC would also answer some of the technical questions in advance, creating more room for qualitative discussion utilising the expertise of panel members, focusing on reflection, victim experience, holistic overviews of hate crimes in LLR. Attendees confirmed they are happy with amendments and request that the OPCC reference where in the papers they found the answers for the scrutiny questions so they can be easily checked if necessary.

The panel are happy with amendments. They request that the OPCC reference where in the papers they found the answers for the pre-answered scrutiny panel questions so that they can locate and review the answers if necessary.

7. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 7th October 2026

Meeting ended 20:00