



Leicestershire OPCC & Partner Agencies
Youth
Out of Court Resolutions Scrutiny Panel Meeting
Minutes

Thursday 11th December 2025 10:00-12:30

Welcome and Attendees:

Bethan Greasley – OPCC
Marc Crisp – Insp Leicestershire Police – OOCR Lead (Chair)
James Wells – Leicestershire Police Youth Justice
Donna Harriman – Leicestershire Police Adult OOCR
Darren Goddard – Crime Registrar
Alison Chick – Bench Chair of Leics Rutland Magistrates Bench
Marianne Connally – CPS
Carly Turner – Youth Justice
Amy Perry-Granger – Youth Justice
Stephanie Edwards – Redsnapper Managed Services Ltd
Kira Day – Redsnapper Managed Services Ltd
Emily Sherman – Commissioning & Contracts Officer

Apologies:

Matt Ditcher, Amon Kotey, Aarti Popat, Lucy Watkins, Louise Bradley, Jonathan Hussey, Emma Hazan, Ivor Sutton, Claudia Wawrzyniak

Urgent Business

Marc raised concerns about the Chair's absence, which has delayed the Adult OOCR Scrutiny Panel. The panel has sought a Vice Chair, but there has been no interest. Plans are in place to reinvigorate this in the New Year.

Action Log

Outstanding action: Marc to bring the Outcome 22 paper agreed at the Chief Officer Team and Exec Group earlier this year. Due to delays and panel restructuring (split from 30 to 15 cases), the paper is now outdated. Insp Crisp has prepared a briefing note on Outcome 22/deferred prosecution which will be shared will panel instead.

Action: Insp Crisp to share Outcome 22 briefing once confirmed at the Corporate Governance Board.

Update on outstanding March 2025 action: Panel requested reassurance regarding a case involving Class B possession and an imitation firearm. The case has since been resolved; both offences were appropriately addressed at the deferred OOCR panel, resulting in a deferred youth caution. Action to be closed.

Panel Cases for Consideration

15 youth OOCR cases were reviewed. Approximately 30% related to domestic incidents. Gradings recorded:

1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	4
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	6
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	5
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	0

Case ID (Youth)	Classification	Rationale
Case A	1 - Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors	Criminal damage – Deferred Conditional Caution. The decision rationale was that, balancing the deliberate nature of the damage against the individual’s age and other mitigating factors, a deferred youth caution was considered an appropriate intervention. The panel agreed with this assessment and confirmed that the outcome was proportionate. Observations were raised regarding a missed opportunity for the child to have been referred via the F7 process into youth justice; however, all agreed this was an observation relating to the previous CR, not this case. Wider case management from an ASB perspective has also been addressed. The decision is in alignment with the gravity matrix.
Case B	1 - Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors	Possession of Class B - CR issued. A CR was issued alongside a referral to Turning Point. It was noted that the offender had received a CR previously within the last 12 months, which raised questions regarding eligibility; however, it was clarified that the previous CR was not for a similar offence. Engagement with Turning Point was detailed as successful, and the panel agreed this was an appropriate outcome.
Case C	3 - Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors	S2 Harassment – CR issued. This was a hate-related incident. The offence was progressed by the neighbourhood team, who identified several youths involved. A CR was issued to one of the involved children who admitted the behaviour, and warning letters were sent to the other involved children. Questions were raised regarding why only one child was dealt with in this manner, but information on this was highlighted as limited. It was

		identified that, internally, CRs should not be issued for hate-related offences. The panel believed this case should have been heard at the youth justice panel, as it was considered a missed opportunity to explore the wider background.
Case D	2 - Appropriate but with observations	Inciting a child under 13 to engage in sexual activity via social media – Youth Conditional Caution issued. The case was heard at the Joint Youth OOCR Panel, where the outcome was decided, and specific offence-related intervention was highlighted as needed. It was noted that the victim’s representative was not satisfied with the outcome, and the offence had a significant impact on the victim. The panel felt the case was dealt with appropriately but highlighted that CPS oversight should have been sought, given the complex nature of the case and the significant impact on the victim.
Case E	2 - Appropriate but with observations	Common assault – CR issued. This was a domestic-related incident. The child accepted responsibility for the offence. The conditions imposed were considered somewhat weak. Although there is comprehensive care in place for the child, questions were raised about whether the issuing officer was aware of this wider involvement. Observations were made regarding the need for improved record-keeping to document decision-making when a CR is issued.
Case F	1 - Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors	Possession of an offensive weapon – Youth Conditional Caution issued. The case was referred to the Joint Youth OOCR panel where the outcome was issued. Youth Justice provided the panel background regarding the child and the circumstances and although there were concerns about lack of full admission and severity of offence, these concerns were alleviated after hearing the circumstances and intervention of the child. Detailed explanation regarding the decision making for a referral to the panel.
Case G	3 - Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS	Possession and use of a firework in a public place – CR issued. A lack of detail in the case was noted as an issue. Concerns around the potential harm that

	Code for Crown Prosecutors	could have been caused were not addressed in the decision-maker's rationale. It was believed that this case should have gone to the panel for oversight to explore wider interventions that could have been considered. The conditions imposed were also felt to be inappropriate.
Case H	3 - Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors	Domestic related ABH – CR issued. Victims did not wish to support a prosecution and were seeking support. Issues were highlighted regarding the conditions attached to the CR and the lack of referral to the panel, as it was unclear how agencies had been involved in providing support. Concerns were raised about the decision-making rationale for issuing a CR. It was noted that inspector oversight should have been sought given the seriousness of offence (ABH). The outcome was considered weak, and the panel felt Youth Justice would have been the more appropriate route.
Case I	3 - Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors	Possession of an offensive weapon – CR issued. This was considered a missed opportunity to understand the complexities of the case and address safeguarding concerns for the involved child. Possession of an offensive weapon should have triggered an automatic referral to the panel. Inspector oversight was noted, but it was believed the CR was authorised without considering the wider circumstances. There was a lack of safeguarding consideration, and the conditions attached to the CR were viewed as weak.
Case J	2 - Appropriate but with observations	ABH – Youth Conditional Caution issued. Dealt with appropriately. However, due to significant impact on victim, it was believed that the panel could have sought CPS consideration, particularly given previous incidents of violence.
Case K	2 - Appropriate but with observations	ABH – Deferred Youth Conditional Caution. The panel felt it may have been more appropriate not to defer, as the child has been heavily involved with Youth Justice for a number of years. It was highlighted that context from Youth

		Justice is essential to inform decision-making and scrutiny by the panel. The outcome was considered appropriate but could have been strengthened by better understanding the child's history of challenges and sense-checking with CPS.
Case L	3 - Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors	ABH – Outcome 22. The decision was referred to the Joint Youth OOCR Panel for consideration of a Youth Conditional Caution or a deferred YCC. Concerns were raised about the lack of detail provided by decision-makers within the Police regarding the child's complex needs. There was also a lack of rationale explaining what interventions have been completed and what specific measures are currently in place for the child.
Case M	2 - Appropriate but with observations	Theft/Possession of an Offensive Weapon – Youth Conditional Caution. Admission at scene confirmed as PACE compliant; panel stressed need for clearer documentation. Mitigating factors noted but outweighed by public concern. Gravity matrix score: 4. Panel highlighted that CPS consultation could have been considered.
Case N	2 - Appropriate but with observations	Theft/Possession of an Offensive Weapon – Youth Conditional Caution. Same case as above. Admission at scene confirmed as PACE compliant; panel stressed need for clearer documentation. Mitigating factors noted but outweighed by public concern. Gravity matrix score: 4. Panel highlighted that CPS consultation could have been considered.
Case O	1 - Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors	Domestic related ABH – Initially issued as a deferred Youth Caution; however, due to lack of engagement, this was converted to a Youth Caution. There was heavy engagement from all partners, and the panel felt the outcome was appropriate given the circumstances and wider complexity of the case.

Action: Insp Crisp to provide feedback to officers on appropriate/inappropriate cases; track via feedback spreadsheet for June 2026 update.



Action: Sgt Wells to update panel on Case D in relation to the child interventions and offence-specific measures which were implemented for the involved child.

Action: Insp Crisp to send out message to Joint Youth OOCR Panel about CPS oversight in cases involving significant psychological harm.

Action: OPCC to discuss scrutiny implementation of external partners or including context into the cases (Betham to liaise with Insp Crisp and Carly Turner).

AOB

None.

Date of Next Meeting

12th March 2026 (Adult) 10:00am – 12:30pm

11th June 2026 (Youth) 10:00am-12:30pm

Meeting closed.