POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER
for Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland
Your Communities - Your Commissioner

Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel

Wednesday 7th October 2026, FHQ Enderby

Minutes

1. Attendees & Introductions

Mrs R Klair (Chair)
Mr A Aggarwall
Mrs B Heller
Ms. J A Oakden
Mr R Chapman
Mr C Watkins
Ms S Seedat
Ms L Vine (Deputy Chair & Ethics & Transparency Panel representative)

Insp J Connor-Iommi (Hate Crime Team – Leicestershire Police)
Mrs C Hornbuckle (Assurance Officer- OPCC)
Ms L Thomas (Administrator & minute taker – OPCC)

Clive Watkins and Saffiya Seedat welcomed to panel. The panel introduce themselves to the new members.

2. Apologies

Mr D Goddard, Sgt A Cartwright

3. Urgent Business

The panel are asked to vote for a new chair. The panel vote for R Klair to be new the chair and vote L Vine as deputy chair.

4. Action Log and Officer Feedback

Action 23 – Officers who were due to be given feedback were on leave at the time. The hate crime team will check if the officers are still on leave or if they can be given feedback.

Action 24 – Victim satisfaction has significantly improved. However, there has been a recent drop due to delays in the hate crime team calling victims back. That is related to officers moved to the front line throughout summer. This is a regular yearly pattern the force observes.

Action 25 – the panel have elected a new chair, Rosie Klair, and deputy, Lisa Vine.

Action 26 & 27– The list of mental health units in LLR was provided by Rosie. The hate crime team has not yet dip sampled 10-20 offences in mental health units due to staff sickness, but it is in preparation for the next meeting.

Action 28 – Feedback from the June panel has been passed to the officers. Positive feedback was provided in one case, and acknowledgement was provided back to the hate crime team from the officer's supervisor. Advice was sent to reopen the case in the mental health unit and link the associated cases with the perpetrator as to not lose context, this is underway and will be followed up by the hate crime team.

5. Data Performance Pack

The panel will receive a more detailed breakdown of data in the Hate crime event next week. The panel look at the given data. There is low reporting of transgender related hate crimes which the panel question due to the high volumes of transgender issues they encounter in their work areas. The panel request more details on the context and severity of cases for transgender hate crimes. The Force acknowledge that more details are already planned for the hate crime day.

6. Panel Cases for Consideration

The assurance officer explains the new format of the packs in which the panel questions are pre-answered determined by the hate crime team and the OPCC assurance officer. The case reports will still be available for the panel should they need to see them and the answers can be changed. This will allow more time for the panel to discuss case specific questions proposed by the assurance officer that will better engage with the members' areas of expertise.

4 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)	1
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and procedure)	1
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	1 – Final case has gone back to hate crime team for further review and analysis will continue in January meeting

Case ID	Classification	Rationale
Case A	1	Stalking case with race and disability hate markers. The victim withdrew support. The victim wasn't contacted within 24 hours by the investigating officer. The panel request that in question 3

		(was the victim contacted by the investigating officer within 24 hours) the assurance officer is clear about what is evidenced in the case reports. If there is no evidence that police have attempted or managed to contact the victim for example. The panel note there was limited evidence that the lines of inquiry were progressed sufficiently. The panel clarify the case was recorded properly as harassment sits under stalking. The panel discuss if the outcome was reasonable but reflect that as the victim withdrew support, it would have been difficult to take the case any further. They discuss the problems caused when victim support is lost as this may allow offenders to continue their behaviour. The hate crime team clarify there is still a log of the suspect's involvement if other cases occur. The hate crime team are currently looking into statistics around when victims withdraw support to see if there are any trends or areas for improvement. Potentially the force could ask about victim support (or loss of) when conducting 14 day contact.
Case B	3	Public order with disability and misogynistic related hate element. No suspect identified. The victim was offered victim first but declined. There is no record that the victim's expectations were managed or that the victim understood that no further enquiries were available due to the lack of evidence. The panel note this should be clearly evidenced by the investigating officer. There was no recorded supervisory review oversight or rationale. Despite the lack of suspect they should still have a supervisory footprint or review. The panel agree that investigative opportunities were very limited in this investigation and scrutiny panels like this demonstrate the forces commitment to tackling hate crime whether they are investigative opportunities or not. The panel discuss how the force can measure success in cases where it is unlikely to achieve a positive outcome (offender is brought to justice). To assess success in crimes without a positive outcome, the force currently use victim satisfaction qualitative measures. The panel suggest that using empathy and providing thorough, clear feedback to victims no matter the outcome is important in providing justice. In this case, the panel reflect due to that the lack evidence in the report it is unclear if the officer treated the victim with empathy to sustain a positive relationship with the police and maintain trust. The panel discuss that if they review cases like this it may be useful for the hate crime team to review the body worn camera footage to see how the officers interacted with the victim.

		The panel felt unclear on if “no further action” is classed as a “positive outcome” and the impact this might have on statistics if it is. The assurance officer will go away and check this. Following on, the panel question what force EDI training looks like and ask if they can see the training content. The assurance officer will retrieve a recent presentation for the panel to review.
Case C	2	Harassment case with disability hate marker. Diversionary, educational or intervention activity actioned. The hate element was identified but not fully recorded until added later by the sergeant. The victim was not contacted within 24hours although the panel acknowledge the summer challenges in officer reallocation. Contact was made by a hate crime officer within 4 days. The victim was offered victim first but declined. The panel discuss if it is appropriate to call victims early in the morning. Especially if the victim has some neurodiversity early calls may mean the victim is not able to engage properly. The panel discuss balancing the nature of shift work with potentially limiting the hours hate crime can make calls to the public. Limiting call times would increase the chance of delays in contacting victims so potentially the hate crime team should consider organising their call list to leave those identified with disability, neurodiversity or learning difficulties until later in the day. The panel discuss whether the hate crime team should record victims’ police confidence level (and their rationale) when they follow up on hate related crimes. The panel suggest that picking certain cases to review victim confidence could be an option to manage the workload. The panel question if the force work with other public organisations as the panel reflect the low levels of hate crimes reported does not match their lived experience in other public facing organisations.
Case D	Deferred.	Harassment with a transphobic hate marker. Case outcome no suspect identified. The panel note the term “transgender male” should be used to describe this victim. The victim was offered Victim First but declined. The panel note no clear record of any discussion regarding the victim's desired investigative outcome or how they wished the matter to be progressed. The reports describe the offender making “inappropriate noises”. The panel were concerned that the kind of noises made could potentially escalate the severity of the case and

		this should have been described in more detail. The panel ask that the hate crime team gather some more information. The force did not request access to the victims call logs to help identify a suspect before closing the case. The panel discuss reopening it as the investigation may not have been thorough or supportive enough. The victim was informed that the case was to be closed but the panel note a lack of empathy or personal comment within the email response to the victim. This may any victims from contacting the police in future and lower police confidence.

Case A –
In view of the above, the panel classified the handling of the case as **[Grade 1]**

Case B –
In view of the above, the panel classified the handling of the case as **[Grade 3]**

Case C –
In view of the above, the panel classified the handling of the case as **[Grade 2]**

Case D –
In view of the above, **the panel have deferred a decision based on further review to be carried out and presented in the January 2027 meeting.**

Actions arising from this meeting:

NEW ACTION - Bring overall victim satisfaction numbers to the panel and an assessment of trends.

NEW ACTION – Assurance officer to send the TOR to the hate crime team

NEW ACTION – Hate crime team to compile data on the transgender hate crimes.

NEW ACTION – Update the tracker for the case outcomes including a summary of themes back dated to start of panel.

NEW ACTION –Check what is counted as a positive outcome in relation to hate crimes and where “no further action” sits in that measure.

NEW ACTION – the hate crime team and OPCC members to watch the body worn footage of case B to determine if the victim was treated empathetically.

NEW ACTION – Share the ethics scrutiny panel EDI training presentation

NEW ACTION – Review when victim calls are being made. Especially if neurodiversity or disability has been identified

NEW ACTION – Review if some kind of victim satisfaction survey could be added to the website.

NEW ACTION – Enquire if case D can be reopened, explore if the officer associated with case D has handled other hate crime cases in a similar manner, enquire which EDI training officer attended.

NEW ACTION – Bring Case D back to the panel with any updates regarding the victim or investigating officer.

NEW ACTION – Jemma to explore if templated correspondence to victims can be peer reviewed by Victim First.

NEW ACTION – check what the “inappropriate noises” were in case D

7. **Any Other Business (AOB)**

The assurance officer clarifies the annual report is due in March 2027 and will be authored by the Chair with support of the assurance officer and wider panel.

8. **Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 13th January 2027

Meeting ended 20:10