

Leicestershire OPCC & Partner Agencies
Adult Out of Court Disposal Scrutiny Panel Meeting
Minutes

Thursday 12th March 2026

1. Welcome and Attendees:

Emily Sherman – (Temporary Chair)
Donna Harriman (Sgt Adult OOCR resolution team)
Jake Neller – red snapper – domestic abuse programme supervisor
Aarti Popat – Operations manager Cara Hampton Trust
Claudia Wawrzyniak – Team Leader Turning Point
Anne Cowan – Bench Magistrate
Bethan Greasley – Assurance officer OPCC
Matt Ditcher - Detective superintendent OOCR strategic lead
James Foreman – Regional manager igneous justice team
Jasrup Sangha – OPCC intern
Ellen Hodgins – Senior Probation officer
Letitia Thomas – OPCC Administrator

2. Apologies

3. Urgent Business

The Chair has left. Bethan asks that if anyone has someone they believe would be appropriate as chair, please can they inform her of their details.
Anne mentions that Bench Magistrates cannot chair the meeting. Anne is leaving and will send the new Bench chair's contact details but wanted to clarify this before she left.
The Chair asks that members provide a replacement if they cannot attend a panel meeting as this will allow them to still run the panel which is an OPCC priority.

4. Previous Minutes

Taken as read

5. Panel Cases for Consideration

15 adult cases were reviewed by the panel. The following gradings were recorded:

1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	4
--	---

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

Case Number	Classification	Rationale
Case A	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with policies and procedures)	Actual bodily harm (ABH) non intimate domestic abuse (DA). Outcome issued – conditional caution. Subject admitted the abuse and policies were adhered to. The caution was appropriately authorised, and safeguarding considerations were explored well. The conditions on the caution were good. This should not have been granted a conditional caution as there was not enough evidence-e or statements instead, it should have been an outcome 22. The offender did not complete the conditions of the caution, but the sergeant did not raise it to CPS as they did not believe they would take any further action. contacts or safeguarding reports were not submitted for the children that witnessed.
Case B	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	ABH Intimate DA - conditional caution. Positive action was taken against the offender to safeguard the victim. Offender showed remorse and admitted to the offence. The outcome was appropriate and authorised appropriately. Strong evidence was collected, and an additional safeguarding report was submitted for the victim. Biometrics of the offender were not taken however.
Case C	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	Criminal damage non-intimate DA – conditional caution. Witness and victim statements collected. A conditional caution was issued for the damage the offender didn't deny which is correct. Incorrect referrals were submitted for the offender. They did not meet the conditions of the caution, and this case is currently going to court. The safeguarding actions could have been stronger.
Case D	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	Theft from a store – community resolution. This was an appropriate resolution and the victim was satisfied. The police engaged in thorough checks on the offender which highlighted this person as being of interest to immigration. The officers did not issue a fine due to the offender's rationale for the theft. The officer made good referrals, but

		the resolutions team amended it to a more appropriate referral
Case E	2 (appropriate with observations)	Antisocial behaviour (ASB) common assault – community resolution. The victim was supportive of this resolution. the conditions for the offender were too similar and would have been hard to manage or measure (given words of advice and informed to avoid the complainant). The offence could have been raised with neighbourhood policing and potentially a stronger condition set. safeguarding measures were put in place for the suspect. Action - OOCR team will check if the children had safeguarding reports submitted.
Case F	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with policies and procedures)	Theft from a store – community resolution. offender denied some of the allegations but showed remorse for the ones they admitted to. It was alleged that the offender was reselling items on a website. The officers could have investigated this further to search for the missing goods. No biometrics were taken from the offender and potentially a conditional caution could have been considered or taking the case to court.
Case G	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with policies and procedures)	ABH intimate DA – outcome 22. The outcome was authorised correctly. The victim referred to other DA incidents. As per recording standards, this should have been recorded as controlling and coercive behaviour. The initial investigation was good, the police tracked and found the offender and recovered the taken items. Safeguarding was submitted for the victim and children and the suspect was arrested. The sergeant did not refer this to CPS as the victim withdrew their statement but the witness statements could have been utilised and CPS advice sought. Local system checks for previous DA were not performed. Social services were made aware but were not given detailed information
Case H	2 (appropriate with observations)	Initially a racially aggravated stalking and fear of violence case this was concluded as a conditional caution for malicious communications. Racial element was no further action, and the stalking and harassment was not made out. The school was contacted to safeguard the victim. The offender admitted to the comments and showed remorse but denied the racial element. Conditional caution was appropriate and can have more impact than the court process in this case. The referral in the condition could have been better e.g reflect and biometrics were not taken.

		There were biometrics on file from a previous case.
Case I	2 (appropriate with observations)	ABH DA – outcome 22. positive action was taken at the scene and the offender was arrested. Conditions applied were good. The victim was referred to several DA agencies, but this should have been referred to CARA and recorded as coercive and controlling behaviour. The result would not have changed much however and an outcome 22 was the right outcome. The incident was not recorded correctly in terms of national standards. Another agency should have had input for the children in the home.
Case J	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with policies)	Assault of a police officer – conditional caution. It is unclear due to a lack of evidence if this is appropriate. A community resolution could have been an appropriate outcome as the offender raised a defence but admitted to the actions. The offender lived outside of the area, but the offender was referred to an appropriate agency outside of LLR
Case K	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	Dog causing injury – community resolution. injury was documented and the victim gave a statement. A statement was taken from the offender but there was no interview conducted. A VCO was submitted by the officer.
Case L	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with policies)	Harassment intimate DA – Conditional caution. This could have been recorded as stalking given the previous relationship between victim and offender and the extent of the contact from the offender. The offender did not fully admit to the abuse which should remove the option of a conditional caution. This could have gone to CPS rather than an out of court resolution. There was not enough safeguarding put in place for the victim.
Case M	2 (appropriate with observations)	Drug possession – community resolution. It was unclear where the offender lived. conditions could have been stronger and contained better referrals. The officer did not perform national police checks for previous offending.
Case N	2 (appropriate with observations)	Public order - Community resolution. There should have been more conditions and stronger conditions; this case could have escalated. There was not much victim engagement. Action – OOCR team to check if this was a section 4 or 5 public order.

Case O	3 (inappropriate and inconsistent with policies)	ABH Non intimate DA – community resolution. the CR was issued for criminal damage. The OOCR team believe this should have been recorded as two separate incidents. The offender refused a community resolution, so the OOCR team questioned why it was still issued. Words of advice were given as a condition which is not preferable but there were other conditions attached. The agency referral was refused by the offender, and it is unknown if they have paid for the damage yet. This potentially would have been better going to CPS, but the victims did not wish for this outcome. A safeguarding report was submitted for the offender. OOCR Team are unsure if safeguarding reports were submitted for the victims. Action – OOCR team to check if safeguarding reports were submitted for the victims
--------	--	---

6. AOB

No other business

7. Date of Next Meeting

11th June 2026 10:00

Meeting closed.