



Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel

Minutes - Wednesday 14th January 2026, FHQ Enderby

1. Welcome, Attendees and Absences

Absent:

Alison Newcombe
David Findlay - Chair
Nandini Chakraborty

Attending:

Rosie Klair – Acting Chair
Bethan Greasley – Assurance officer
Letitia Thomas - OPCC admin
Sgt Angela Cartwright – Force
Barbara Czyznikowska
Ajay Aggarwall
Darren Goddard – Crime Registrar
Jenny Ardley Oakden
Brigitte Heller
Lisa Vine – Ethics and Transparency Panel
Richard Chapman

2. Introductions and Apologies

Introductions: Letitia Thomas – Administrator (OPCC)

Apologies: David Findlay, Nandini Chakraborty

3. Urgent Business

No urgent business

4. Action Log and Officer Feedback

Action 17 - Assurance officer has separated the data packs into the 3 cases with page numbers for ease of reading – **ACTION CLOSED**

Action 18 – (Force engage with liaison officers to clarify process for providing CCTV evidence.) The Force spoke with the Football Liaison Officer, who confirmed that have developed a good working relationship with staff. While there are occasional issues

accessing the CCTV when authorised personnel are unavailable, the liaison officer stated that evidence is generally provided in a timely manner.

Action 19 - Officer feedback. Praise was given to the officer involved in the case and they were appreciative of this from the panel. **ACTION CLOSED**

Action 20 - Feedback was given to the officers in case that was graded a 3. They were receptive to the feedback and admitted that there were areas to improve. **ACTION CLOSED**

5. Hate Crime Statistics (Data Performance Pack)

Taken as read

6. 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)	
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	1
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and procedure)	1
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	

Case ID	Classification	Rationale
Case 1	2	The panel found the outcome appropriate but there was a lack of supervisory footprint. Some information was not recorded thoroughly enough like the content of the letter of apology.
Case 2	3	Insufficient recording of information. For example, involved persons not recorded as a person record on the system and no record of who specifically was provided letters of advice.

Case A – Report of male refusing to leave the premises becoming irate and using verbal racial abuse. Police attended and suspect was identified and arrested at the scene. Suspect was interviewed and admitted to the offence and was given a Conditional caution. The initial incident log included other incidents as it occurred during a nighttime shift. This made the log confusing and did not add much detail about case A.

New action – if the incident in the case was saved on a log containing other unrelated incidents, please do not include the log in the pack.

The panel comment that the case got wrapped up quickly which was good. The panel highlights other witnesses weren't interviewed, Jenny responds that it seems other witnesses weren't necessary as the suspect admitted to the crime and victim was happy with the outcome.

There was a mention of a sledgehammer during the incident, the panel identified that this was not used by the suspect however highlighted that this could have been made clearer by the recording officer.

Rosie asks if an email apology was appropriate. The panel determine this is what the victim wanted.

The panel question if the victim was supportive of the resolution due to the wording in the report being confusing. The force clarifies the victim's statement states the victim was supportive of a prosecution but a caution was more appropriate. Richard raises that maybe using a capital R or lower-case r could be a way to differentiate between a resolution (the case has been resolved) and an Out of Court Resolution.

Lisa asks if the victims current needs section has been completed as it doesn't appear to have been. The force is introducing a new victim needs assessment to make sure needs are captured properly (for example: how to make things accessible for the victim). The victim declined victim services, but the victim was referred to the victim first website. The new needs assessment will cover going back to the victim and double-checking needs. Jenny compliments the Hate Crime Officer's section on the report. It is very clear and succinct.

The Force state that the details of the suspects genuine remorse was not recorded on the system. Although there is an officer update, there is not a summary of the interview that would usually be completed. This also raises the issue that the letter of apology sent to the victim is not summarised, so the content is unknown. Richard raises an issue in writing a letter of apology that shows genuine remorse - would a suspect be penalised if they have a low reading age or any reason to be unable to explain themselves well in written form which could impact a letter of apology? The force respond that they would have an appropriate adult present to ensure the suspect can understand the process and have assistance. This could include someone writing down what the suspect says for a letter of apology.

Rosie highlights if further incidents were to occur between this suspect and victim, the lack of evidence recording could impact outcomes. The force responds that as the officer has confirmed a letter of apology has been sent, and the suspect has met their condition, there would be very limited impact to other incidents.

Throughout the report the panel find that the recording officer has not evidenced supervision enough.

The panel concludes that although the actions taken seem appropriate the letter of apology, supervisory discussion and the authorisation of the caution have not been recorded properly.

Panel classified case handling as **[Grade 2]**

Case B – Report made of harassment from a group of youths. Suspects were identified and issued a community resolution and given words of advice. Advice letters were also sent.

Lisa questions wording used to describe the suspects. The Force clarifies the descriptions of suspects would have been the victim's words.

Some sections of the report do not appear completed. The force clarifies that the officer spoke to the victim in person so some of these sections have been completed differently. This portion could have been removed from the case pack as it isn't relevant.

Jenny asks about the formatting in the email contact sent to the victim. The force clarifies that part of the email are automated responses.

Lisa questions some wording used in the report. The Force clarifies that the officer was differentiating between hate crimes against an actual protected characteristic and a presumed or perceived characteristic.

The panel discusses whether video footage was investigated properly. There is mention that the victim had video footage of the incident but there is no further mention of this in the officer's reports.

The panel discusses that as the disability of the caller isn't listed, this makes it unclear if the support resources provided were accessible for the victim.

The panel reflect that in the 28-day supervisor review, the sergeant has highlighted many of the issues in the initial reporting of the case. They have highlighted what needs to be done to correct these issues, but it isn't clear if any of these actions were followed up on.

Lisa raises that some of the wording used to describe the suspects is unnecessary and comes across negative. There is a lack of consistency in descriptions and not all of the suspects are described. The panel discuss what wording is appropriate when describing suspects.

A community resolution was issued and some advice letters (ASB letters). The outcomes for the other suspects haven't been recorded into corporate memory. It is unclear why there are varying different outcomes for the suspects. There could be justification for this, and the supervisor review completed by a sergeant asks for this to be documented, but it has not been.

Lisa asks why there wasn't a letter of apology - A letter of apology cannot be enforced with a community resolution they have to agree to it. The report should detail What words of advice were given. Richard agrees this could be light of an outcome for a victim that could find the harassment particularly distressing. The panel discusses that there is reference to other family members being victims, but the report does not clarify how the suspects knew where other family members lived.

The panel view this case as being dealt with more like antisocial behaviour than a hate crime. Local policy dictates a community resolution cannot be issued for a hate crime, but it is unclear if the community resolution and letters were sent to the suspect who committed the hate element of the case, or to the other suspects.

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

New 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

7. AOB

No other business.

8. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 14th April 2026

Meeting end 20:00