

Leicestershire OPCC & Partner Agencies

Adult Out of Court Resolution Scrutiny Panel Meeting

Adult Out of Court Disposal Scrutiny Panel Meeting

10TH September 2026

1. Welcome and Attendees:

Clare Hornbuckle – Assurance Officer (Temporary Chair)
Letitia Thomas – Administrator OPCC
Shruti Pattani – Performance and Assurance Manager, OPCC
Julie Toone – Diversion Hub Officer, Leicestershire Police
Donna Harriman – Sgt Diversion Hub, Leicestershire Police
James Wells – Sgt Youth Justice Team
Simon Edwards – Chairman, Bench of Magistrates
Lisa Bateman – Restorative Justice Lead, Victims First
Frances Deepwell – Ethics and Transparency Panel Member
Jake Neller – Contracts Manager, Red Snapper

For the new attendees, Clare advises that the panel aims to get panel member's responses on whether they feel the police outcome is reasonable and proportionate and that panel members are encouraged to share their views/responses to each case.

2. Apologies

Steph Edwards, Insp Marc Crisp, Denis Tanfa, Chloe Thatcher

3. Previous Minutes & Action Log

Minutes taken as read.

Action – Donna advises that in some of the cases for officer feedback from March, the panel need to have more in depth conversations with OICs to gain further information. She will be able to relay the feedback in the next couple weeks.

4. Urgent Business

No updates.

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)	6
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	7
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	2
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	0

Case	Grading	Rationale
A	2 (appropriate with observations)	<u>Common Assault - Community Resolution issued</u> The victim was happy to have this settled with a community resolution and only wanted some compensation for the damage to their possessions. The panel think the outcome was appropriate. The panel note the victim wasn't updated as they should be updated every 28 days. The force respond that the community resolution wasn't issued at the time it was issued 3 months later. There seems to have been difficulty getting hold of the involved parties, so the CR was sent in the post. No signatures were obtained on the CR although this is acceptable as long as both parties were satisfied with their understanding. The officer doesn't know if the offender paid the compensation. The force are most concerned about the delay in sending the CR.
B	1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	<u>Possession of class B drugs - Conditional caution issued</u> (there is an error in the case summary listing this case as a CR). This case is still live; the offender is still within the compliance window to fulfil their conditions. There was a full admission of guilt, and the offender was referred to Reflect. There was body worn footage of the witnesses' accounts and the drugs have been seized by the force. There was an issue in continuity regarding where the substance was found and the substance has not been testing to determine if they are class B. No statement was obtained from the witnesses. A community resolution could have been appropriate but given the previous drug

		related issues with the offender the officers granted a CC instead. The offender is currently not within the country but the force clarify that as leaving the country was not a condition the offender was free to leave the country as they did. The police will visit the address to see when the offender will be returning. Reflect have closed the case for now but the offender needs to return within the condition window to be rereferred to Reflect and avoid a court summons.
C	1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	<u>Common assault Domestic Abuse (DA) related - Conditional Caution issued.</u> The offender was not detained due to the unavailability of an appropriate adult, so a later interview was considered. They retrieved a victim statement but no witness statement although there are video recordings of the event. The offender admitted to the assault and showed remorse. Leicestershire force are able to authorise an out of court resolution for DA related offences which the force believe was appropriate in this circumstance. Safeguarding reports were completed. This event was categorised as standard risk on the DASH risk assessment but due to other factors, this relationship has been referred to MARAC. A domestic abuse intervention was listed as a condition which the offender has complied with and there has been no further DA. The second condition to not commit other offences was too broad which the police note. They also note that there is some discrepancy to what crime has been issued a conditional caution. The force will clarify the CC hasn't been issued for ABH on any of the documents. The panel note there wasn't an alcohol or drug related condition despite the described alcohol related issues. The force explain the DA intervention would refer to turning point afterwards if they felt it was necessary. The panel ask why the mental health service did not attend. The force clarify that the mental health service advised over the phone and the officers attending determined that this case was related more to alcohol use rather than a mental health crisis although the service can follow up if they deem it necessary. The panel reflect that the report makes it seem like they didn't come due to the intoxication which is bad wording.
D	1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and/or the	<u>Assault - Community Resolution issued</u> Given that the offender has not offended in the previous 12 months they were eligible for a CR. A condition was attached to attend a victim awareness cause which the force note was a positive addition. The conditions are in place for 5 weeks which is currently still live and

	CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	monitored. The victim wished for this to be settled with a CR and the resolution was signed by both parties. The panel note that nothing was offered for restorative justice, and this case could have qualified for a restorative approach. The diversion Hub plan to bring restorative justice in during phase 2 of the department reorganisation. The panel also note that no CCTV or witness statements were collected, and the inciting incident was 11 months prior to the offence suggesting a long gestation period. They question whether the conditions were strong enough given the offenders history and suggest the investigation may not have been thorough enough. The force respond that this case would more likely take a civil route, and they were limited on conditions that could have been applied. For now, harassment cannot be considered but the force note a CR isn't devoid of consequence – it does show up on checks like an enhanced DBS. Red Snapper and the force note that the intervention on the caution is an evidence-based intervention shown to have impact on offenders and the force note the last offence with an outcome was over 3 years ago.
E	2 (appropriate with observations)	<u>Theft from a person – Community Resolution issued</u> The offender admitted taking the item whilst in interview. Victim statement was obtained and the victim wanted a to settle with a CR especially as the victim felt there was mental health issues involved. The force note the offender was on bail but as this bail was due to be cancelled, he was eligible for a CR. The officers involved submitted safeguarding concerns for the offender but not the victim. Although the CR was appropriate, the force feel the supervisor's rationale for why a CC was not given should have been clearer due to previous offences. The force assume it was to avoid the national record and to provide early support. Substance use was identified and an intervention given as a condition. Given the mental health aspect of this the fore agree a CC would not have been proportionate. The panel question if the officers attending explored whether the offender knew the victim thoroughly or not as this was part of the offender's statement. The panel feel the investigation was not thorough enough although the outcome appropriate.
F	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	<u>Common Assault DA related - Conditional Caution issued</u> Suspect wasn't arrested. CCTV was collected with an account from 2 witnesses, but no statements were taken. The offender has no previous DA history, and a voluntary interview was performed and although the officers did not do a full write up, she admitted the offence. No injury was

		caused. A DA intervention referral was issued, and the offender has complied with the conditions. The provider are able to refer to further interventions if necessary. The force clarify the DA element has been recognised as the case has been registered as a DA setting. It is nationally mandated that DA elements are reported so any previous would have been reported in the offender's history. The panel query why the length of conditions varies. The force respond that conditions were determined by the officers and sergeants involved. The Diversion Hub are now responsible for the issuing of conditions to help standardise and they are reviewing all the force's active conditions. The victim is reported as unable to support prosecution. The force clarify that there was a national push to change the language used in reporting to improve how victims are viewed in court, but in this case the rationale for the victim feeling unable to support has not been recorded. Any risk to the victim's safety however would have been captured in the DASH risk assessment.
G	2 (appropriate with observations)	<u>Public order - Community Resolution issued</u> The offender admitted to the offence and showed remorse but there was no formal interview. A victim signature was not obtained for the CR and there is no evidence the victim was consulted. There were no similar offences in the last 12 months so the offender was eligible for a CR but the force reflect a CC may have been more appropriate. Turning point was listed as a condition which is an appropriate intervention, but the force can compel completion of CC conditions which may have been more appropriate. a CR was still an appropriate outcome however. The lack of interview in custody is likely the rationale for the CR.
H	3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	<u>Affray/Common Assault - Community Resolution issued</u> Another assault at the same was noted but the witness refused to provide details, CCTV was not collected nor a victim statement despite the victim supporting prosecution. The offender was arrested but it is unclear if this was for affray or common assault. The offender was de-arrested due to the lack of further threat which the force deem appropriate action in this case. The offender admitted to the offence (although the victim denies being intimidated) and has no previous offences. Force believe the CR was meant to be issued for common assault in which case this case would have been managed correctly. As it stands however, the officers did not investigate the affray properly and affray would need Insp sign off for CR

		which has not been obtained. The force clarify threat can be classed as a common assault even though the offender was stopped before physically attacking. The panel discuss that the case has not been recorded consistently, and the investigation was not thorough enough.
I	2 (appropriate with observations)	<u>Criminal damage DA related - Conditional caution issued</u> this was a medium on the DASH risk assessment as no physical harm was caused. There are mental health concerns regarding the offender. The victim does not want to prosecute due to the involvement of children. The offender admitted to the offence, showed remorse and shared concern regarding their mental health that they already have support involved in. They did not reach the evidential threshold for a CC and an outcome 22 would have been more appropriate. Panel note that if it went to court it would most likely lead to a positive outcome. The force also note that this case was recorded in great detail and rationale/decisions were thoroughly explained. Reflect was given as an intervention which was correct. The panel note the offender partially breached the conditions by returning to address of offence however the Force contextualise that this was agreed between the offender and victim for the offender to collect belongings, however it may have been more appropriate to do a variation on that condition. An outcome 22 would still show on the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme. The panel ask if there is a mental health intervention currently available for referrals. The force respond there is not but a safeguarding report was completed which can be picked up by agencies.
J	2 (appropriate with observations)	<u>Theft by employee - Community Resolution issued</u> Offender came in for voluntary interview and was eligible for a CR due to no similar offences in the last 12 months. It seems only a portion of the value stolen has been repaid but the company agreed to the resolution. The panel theorise that this may be a staggered repayment. The force note that an intervention listed as a condition would have been an improvement on the CR which the panel agreed with however the CR was still an appropriate and proportionate outcome.
K	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	<u>Public Order – Community Resolution issued</u> The victim was unable to offer a statement and wanted the offender to be given words of advice and did not want them to be criminalised, the offender was therefore

		spoken to in a safe setting and not arrested. A condition was given to provide a written apology, and although they did not comply with this it was established that the offender's mental health crisis was a factor in the offence and compliance. Usually, the force do not support words of advice as a condition but as it would have been challenging for the offender to access an intervention whilst being a patient, thus it was deemed appropriate by the panel in these circumstances.
L	1 (appropriate and consistent with policies)	<u>Possession of Cannabis – Community Resolution issued</u> All conditions were complied with, and previous offending did not involve drugs. The panel agree the outcome was reasonable and proportionate.
M	3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and/or the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors)	<u>Actual Bodily Harm – Conditional Caution issued</u> Offender was verbally abusive during this incident and report cites a further incident from the night before in which offender was physically abusive. Report states that offender was intoxicated during both incidents but admitted to the parts of the offence they could remember. Offender was interviewed and the victim provided a statement. The force note the evidence gathered, the safeguarding report and the conditions suggested were very good. However, due to a CC issued for DA previously, the force do not have the authority to issue another and CPS should have authorised this CC so that they could consider alternative routes, but they were not contacted. Therefore, the outcome is inappropriate and inconsistent with force policy.
N	2 (appropriate with observations)	<u>Criminal Damage – Community Resolution issued</u> The victim felt able to support prosecution but wished for this to be issued a CR. The offender admitted to her behaviour and showed remorse. Police mental health service was contacted, and no further safeguarding concerns were identified. The force believe a CR was appropriate but felt the conditions could have been stronger. The panel agree - a letter of apology for example could have been a better option.
O	2 (appropriate with observations)	<u>Theft from a store - Community Resolution issued</u> This was not the only store stolen from by this offender but all stores were contacted and agreed to a CR. There is underlying substance use issues within previous offending although no previous theft. The force theorise this was issued a CR to avoid a formal record, but the rationale was not thoroughly documented by the officers involved. Compensation was not listed as a condition and there was no record of this was considered thoroughly. If

		a CC was issued, the repayment could have been managed over 16 weeks which would have been more manageable for the offender. The panel consider whether referral to CPS was considered. The force believe this would not have gone to CPS as they would have opted to intervene with interventions rather than prosecuting. There is now a business crime intervention which was not available at the time.
--	--	---

ACTION – provide feedback to the officers including positive feedback

ACTION – members to delete the email of the case summaries

ACTION – send Simon the invitation for the following youth panel meetings.

6. Any Other Business

Simon notes that the additional case information provided by Donna has been very helpful in understanding the cases and gives his thanks.

The annual report for the panel is being signed off with the Police and Crime Commissioner so Clare will distribute this once sign off is complete.

7. Date of Next Meeting

11th March 2027 10am-12:30pm

Meeting closed.

CASE NO:	CASE TYPE:	RESOLUTION:	GRADING	PANEL COMMENTS:
A.	Common Assault	Community Resolution	2	The victim wasn't updated every 28 days. It took 3-months to send the CR. There were no signatures on the CR although this is sometimes acceptable.
B.	Possession of Class B Drugs	Conditional Caution	1	No statement was obtained from the witnesses.
C.	Common Assault (DA Related)	Conditional Caution	1	A condition to not commit other offences is too broad. There is some discrepancy in what crime has been issued a conditional caution
D.	Assault	Community Resolution	1	The panel positively note the condition to attend a victim awareness course. No CCTV or witness statements were collected. This case could have qualified for a restorative approach. The panel question whether the conditions were strong enough.
E.	Theft from a person	Community Resolution	2	The supervisor's rationale for why a CC was not given should have been clearer due to previous offending. The panel feel the investigation was not thorough enough.
F.	Common Assault (DA Related)	Conditional Caution	1	No witness statements were taken
G.	Public Order	Community Resolution	2	Offender was not formally interviewed. A victim signature was not obtained for the CR.
H.	Affray/Common Assault	Community Resolution	3	it is unclear if the CR was issued for affray or common assault. If this was an affray case, the

				officers did not investigate properly, and the CR would need Insp sign off. CCTV was not collected nor a victim statement.
I.	Criminal Damage (DA Related)	Conditional Caution	2	The evidential threshold for a CC was not achieved. An outcome 22 would have been more appropriate. The panel positively note that this case was very detailed, and decision rationales were thorough.
J.	Theft by Employee	Community Resolution	2	Listing an intervention condition would have been an improvement on the CR
K.	Public Order	Community Resolution	1	outcome was reasonable and proportionate.
L.	Possession of Cannabis	Community Resolution	1	outcome was reasonable and proportionate.
M.	Actual Bodily Harm	Conditional Caution	3	The evidence gathering, safeguarding reports and CC conditions were very good. Due to a CC issued for DA previously however, the force did not have the authority to issue another.
N.	Criminal Damage	Community Resolution	2	CR was appropriate but the conditions could have been stronger. Like a letter of apology.
O.	Theft from a Store	Community Resolution	2	the CR rationale and the consideration of compensation was not thoroughly documented. A CC may have been more appropriate.