



College of
Policing

Brief

Protection for victims of stalking →

Tasers – bidding due to open →

Consensual body modification? →

college.police.uk

ISSUE 1 | JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2020

Updates in police law, operational policing practice and criminal justice, produced by the **Legal Services Department** at the College of Policing



Police Regulations
2020 update



Judicial review
permission
refused



Domestic violence
orders –
record high



Police complaints
and discipline
changes made



The College of Policing Brief is a scanning publication intended to capture and consolidate key criminal justice issues, both current and future, impacting on all areas of policing.

During the production of the Brief, information is included from governmental bodies, criminal justice organisations and research bodies. As such, the Brief should prove an invaluable guide to those responsible for strategic decision making, operational planning and police training.

The College of Policing is also responsible for Authorised Professional Practice (APP). APP is the official and most up-to-date source of policing practice and covers a range of policing activities such as: police use of firearms, treatment of people in custody, investigation of child abuse and management of intelligence. APP is available online at app.college.police.uk

Any enquiries regarding this publication or to request copies in accessible formats please contact us at brief@college.pnn.police.uk

© College of Policing Limited 2020

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Non-Commercial College Licence v1.1. except where otherwise stated. To view this licence visit college.police.uk/Legal/Documents/Non-Commercial%20College%20Licence%20v1-1.pdf

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available for download at college.police.uk

Contents

ISSUE 1 | JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2020

Editorial	4	Policing	
Share with our community	5	News	16
College news	6	Police leaders start bidding for Tasers	16
Permission refused for judicial review	6	Changes to be made to the police complaints and discipline process	16
		To tackle 'county lines' drug offending, greater collaboration and consistency is needed	17
Legal updates		Our workforce	17
Statutory Instruments	7	Norfolk Constabulary – A need to improve crime recording arrangements	17
The Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020, The Police (Performance) Regulations 2020 and The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020	7	Suffolk Constabulary – Crime recording improvements	18
Bills	7	Criminal justice news	
Criminal Records Bill [HL] 2019-20	7	New measures introduced to protect victims of stalking	19
Extradition (Provisional Arrest) Bill [HL] 2019-20	7	Record high for domestic violence orders	19
Modern Slavery (Victim Support) Bill [HL] 2019-20	8	Human trafficking case of Ms A referred to the crown court by the Commission	20
Prisoners (Disclosure of Information About Victims) Bill 2019-20	8	Reports and statistics	21
The Crown Court (Recording and Broadcasting) Order 2020	9	Operation of police powers under the Terrorism Act 2000 and subsequent legislation: Arrests, Outcomes, and Demographics	21
The Firearms (Amendment) (No. 2) Rules 2019	9	Police use of force statistics for England and Wales: April 2018 to March 2019	23
Before the court			
Ahmed & Ors, R v [2019] EWCA Crim 1704	10		
McCarthy, R v [2019] EWCA Crim 2202	12		
Richards, R v [2019] EWCA Crim 2238	14		

Editorial

Dear readers,

Welcome to the Brief, your monthly update of what's new in the criminal justice field, produced by the Legal Services team at the College of Policing.

Within this month's edition:

- *McCarthy, R v* [2019] EWCA Crim 2202 – an appeal against the sentence of an individual who caused grievous bodily harm whilst carrying out body modification procedures in the course of his business. The case considers whether the 'consent of the victims' is relevant to the sentence and if so, to what extent.
- HMICFRS' reports in relation to crime recording for Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies.
- The use of police powers under the Terrorism Act 2000.

To find out more about the College and what we do, including information on the PEQF training, please visit the [College of Policing website](#).

We hope that our publication supports our police officers and staff in their work. We are always looking for ways to get better at what we do, so if you have any feedback or ideas for future content, **get in touch**.

Thank you for reading,

The Legal Services Team

[↑ Back to contents](#)

For subscription requests, further information or to send us ideas about what you would like to see in upcoming editions, please email us at:

brief@college.pnn.police.uk

Share with our community

There's lots of great work and innovation taking place across the police service, with some remarkable people working diligently to support and safeguard the communities they serve. Sharing this news can jump-start collaboration and growth, so we want to hear from you.

We'd like to invite police officers and staff to contribute by including a monthly guest article under one of the following categories:

Pride: Tell us something about your team or a project you're working on which has produced results you're particularly proud of.

Innovation: New initiatives and projects, what worked and what didn't, and how you learnt from it.

Collaboration: Tell us about the relationships with other forces and external agencies which help your team.

Your team, our community: Diversity, equality, inclusion and key support mechanisms – that special team member whose hard work deserves recognition in the Brief.

If you'd like to contribute, please email brief@college.pnn.police.uk and we'll provide you with the information you need.

We'd like to pick one article a month, and will ensure there is a wide variety of authors and forces. We will inform you in advance if your article has been chosen.

We look forward to hearing from you.

[↑ Back to contents](#)

College news

Permission refused for judicial review

The College has been involved in ongoing legal proceedings after a challenge was brought by Lincolnshire Police regarding the College's work to update existing training for new officers joining policing. After careful consideration of the grounds of the claim and all relevant evidence, the courts refused permission for judicial review for a second time.

The new training for officers joining policing will be up and running in more than 30 police forces across England and Wales over the next year.

Officers are already undergoing the updated training in Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, South Wales, Gwent, Dyfed-Powys, West Midlands, Northumbria, Avon and Somerset, and Staffordshire.

The new course updates existing training introduced 13 years ago and better prepares officers for the demands placed on them. The programme now includes digital policing, vulnerability, disclosure and mental health, while still requiring police officers to have empathy, compassion and common sense. It is important to note that, while the training was independently assessed as being degree standard, a degree is not required to join as a police constable.

Read the full article [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Legal updates

Statutory Instruments

The Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020, The Police (Performance) Regulations 2020 and The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

These three instruments revoke and replace: the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2012, the Police (Performance) Regulations 2012 and the Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2012, together with various other instruments and provisions that amend or modify those 2012 instruments. They reflect reforms to the system to improve the procedures for dealing with allegations of police misconduct and underperformance.

These instruments form part of a group that establish a reformed system for handling complaints about the police and for dealing with police disciplinary matters. The other instrument is the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2020.

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Bills

Criminal Records Bill [HL] 2019-20

A Bill to amend the length of time for which an individual may have a criminal record under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974.

The first reading took place on 13 January. However, the second reading, is yet to be scheduled.

Read the full Bill [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Extradition (Provisional Arrest) Bill [HL] 2019-20

A bill to create a power of arrest, without warrant, for the purpose of extraditing people for serious offences.

First reading took place on 7 January. The second reading is scheduled for 4 February.

Read the full Bill [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Modern Slavery (Victim Support) Bill [HL] 2019-20

A bill to make provisions about supporting victims of modern slavery.

The first reading took place on 13 January. However, the second reading is yet to be scheduled.

Read the full Bill [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Prisoners (Disclosure of Information About Victims) Bill 2019-20

A Bill that aims to place an obligation on the Parole Board to take into account any failure by a prisoner serving a sentence for unlawful killing, or for taking or making an indecent image of a child to disclose information about the victim.

This public Bill was introduced to the House of Commons and given its First Reading on Wednesday 8 January 2020. The second reading date has not been announced.

Read the full Bill [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

The Crown Court (Recording and Broadcasting) Order 2020

Due to draft legislation laid by the government on 16 January 2020, television cameras will be allowed to broadcast from Crown Courts in England and Wales in the foreseeable future.

The Crown Court (Recording and Broadcasting) Order 2020 will make it possible for the sentencing remarks of High Court and Senior Circuit judges to be broadcasted. However, no other court users, such as victims, witnesses, jurors, or court staff, or other court content, will be filmed.

Broadcasters will need to seek permission from the judiciary in advance, and any filming will be subject to the usual reporting restrictions. Filming is already permitted in the Supreme Court, however, this is separate to this contract, and is carried out by the Supreme Court itself.

Read the full article [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

The Firearms (Amendment) (No. 2) Rules 2019

These rules make several amendments to the Firearms Rules 1998, in particular the control of the acquisition and possession of weapons. They implement the requirements of EU Directive 2017/853 to address the misuse of firearms for criminal purposes and consider recent terrorist acts.

The amendments restrict the acquisition and possession of firearms by persons under the age of 18. They permit a person under the age of 18 to acquire or possess a firearm provided responsibility for secure storage arrangements is assumed by a parent or adult who holds a valid firearm authorisation. They also set out marking requirements for firearms and essential component parts of firearms manufactured or imported into the EU. Finally, they amend the particulars to be entered by firearms dealers into the register of transactions under Part 4 of Schedule 5 to the Rules (firearms dealers' register of transactions) to reflect the changes to the requirements for marking firearms.

Read the full statutory instrument [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Before the court

Ahmed & Ors, R v [2019] EWCA Crim 1704

KEY MESSAGES

- An appeal judgement against the sentence of three 20-year-old appellants, Fayz Ahmed, Raheel Ahmed and Ashnaur Rahman.
- Submissions include the judge's failure to take into account mitigating features, ie, that the offenders were 17 at the time and of previous good character and that the judge placed too much weight on aggravating features, ie, risk of injury to others and seriousness of the victim's injuries.
- The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeals of Fayz Ahmed and Raheel Ahmed and dismissed Ashnaur Rahman's leave to appeal.

This is an appeal against a sentence, arising after a trial at Leeds Crown Court, which took place on 11 April 2019. Fayz Ahmed and Raheel Ahmed appeal against sentence with the leave of a single judge and Ashnaur Rahman's application for leave has been referred.

At around 6pm on 18 June 2016, Dmitrijs Purgalvis and his girlfriend were sat in the back of his BMW car at Birstall Retail Park. In an attempt to reverse into a parking space, Fayz Ahmed hit Purgalvis' car with his mother's Seat Leon car. Raheel Ahmed and Rahman were both passengers in his car, with Raheel Ahmed seated in the front and Rahman seated in the back.

When Purgalvis got out his car to inspect the damage and exchange information, he noticed that the Seat Leon was driving away. Subsequently, he shouted at the car to stop and began to chase it. When he reached the open front passenger window he was punched by Rahman whilst being held in place by Raheel Ahmed. With the victim pleading to be allowed to get off, Fayz Ahmed drove at high speeds around the car park. Fayz Ahmed then knowingly drove his car close to the back of a parked station wagon, which resulted in a high-speed collision with the victim. Purgalvis fell to the floor and the appellants drove off. The victim sustained multiple serious injuries, including a brain injury and a punctured lung. The appellants were arrested that evening.

Three years later, following a delayed trial before His Honour Judge Batiste and a jury, the three appellants were convicted. Fayz Ahmed was convicted

of causing grievous bodily harm with intent, contrary to section 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. Raheel Ahmed and Rahman were acquitted on this count but convicted of causing serious injury by dangerous driving, contrary to section 1A of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

On 22 May 2019 they were sentenced by the same judge. Fayz Ahmed was sentenced to 10 years' detention in a young offender institution, Raheel Ahmed to 20 months' detention in a young offender institution and Rahman to 18 months' detention in a young offender institution. They were all also disqualified from driving for different periods.

Andrea Parnham appeared on behalf of the driver, Fayz Ahmed. Her principal submission was that the starting point for an adult offender of 15 years, owing to the judge placing too much emphasis on aggravating factors, was too high. Primarily, she relied on the consultant vascular surgeon's finding that there was no reduction in the victim's life expectancy as a result of the offence. She also submitted that the judge had erred by concluding the risk of injury to the public aggravated the sentence to such an extent. She recognised that, given the time the offence occurred, the retail park was relatively quiet, as shown from CCTV footage.

The Court of Appeal found that the judge's starting point for the sentencing range was justified because the injuries had an ongoing effect on the victim, as heard from Purgalvis. The CCTV showed children at the retail park, including a child in a pushchair. To drive at such excessive speeds was to cause risk of injury to others.

Parnham submitted that the judge had been wrong to put weight on the appellant's apparent maturity when he gave evidence and not enough on his actual age, a decision which led to a failure to properly discount the sentence in accordance with the Guideline on Sentencing Children and Young People. She also argued that proper weight to the delay (which was not Fayz Ahmed's fault) was not given. Fayz was now 20, married and had obtained a degree. The court found that the full one-third discount for age is not obligatory but may be considered. Subsequently, the decision was that the sentence passed by the judge was not manifestly excessive and the appeal was dismissed.

In addition to similar submissions, Mr Worsley and Mr Quinn also took regard to Raheel Ahmed and Rahman's lack of driving experience and the fact that neither of them had been the actual driver. However, the court emphasised the numerous means of assistance and encouragement that they had both provided and the seriousness of harm to justify the sentence.

On Raheel Ahmed's behalf, Worsley drew attention to the judge's written route to the verdict, which enabled the jury to convict Raheel Ahmed (and Rahman) of causing serious injury by dangerous driving if they had encouraged or assisted Fayz Ahmed on a number of bases. Worsley submitted that it was not clear from the jury's verdict which of these bases or combination of bases they had accepted, and therefore the judge should have sentenced Raheel Ahmed on a basis which gave him the benefit of the most favourable interpretation of the verdict. In his sentencing remarks, however, it was apparent that he had not made these findings.

The court ruled, however, that the judge had correctly adopted the right approach as he was entitled to make up his own mind. Therefore, the appeals were dismissed.

Read the full judgement [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

McCarthy, R v [2019] EWCA Crim 2202

KEY MESSAGES

- An appeal judgement by leave of the single judge against the sentence of an offence committed by the appellant whilst carrying out body modification procedures in the course of his business.
- The case considers whether the consent of the victims of offences of causing grievous bodily harm (GBH) with intent is relevant to the sentence and, if so, to what extent.
- The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal on the primary basis that body modification does not fall under an exception against the general rule that consent does not negate liability.

On 21 March 2019, in the Crown Court at Wolverhampton, the appellant, after pleading guilty to three offences of causing GBH with intent, was sentenced by HHJ Nawaz to 40 months' imprisonment concurrent on each Count, making a total of 40 months' imprisonment.

The three offences took place between July 2012 and July 2015 at Dr Evil's Body Modification Emporium where the appellant was a body piercer, tattooist and

carried out unregulated surgical procedures paid for by customers. The offences included: the splitting of a female's tongue; the removal of a male's nipple; and the removal of a male, Ezechiel Lott's, ear. All of the procedures were carried out without the use of anaesthetic and McCarthy had no medical qualifications.

On 12 February 2019 the appellant pleaded guilty to three offences, almost a year after a failed appeal against a ruling that the consent of the customers (which the prosecution accepted was present) provided no defence to the charges McCarthy faced. On 21 March 2019 he was subsequently sentenced to 40 months' imprisonment. This was thought to be the first prosecution of its kind.

The consent itself involved a form in which the appellant used the description of a "qualified modification artist" to describe his performance of services and "sterile" to describe the working environment. Through this form, Lott gave confirmation that he was made aware of the risks that the procedure would bring, that he was having the procedure done through no choice but his own, and that it would not be the responsibility of the appellant if any medical issues were to arise. Previous court dates indicated that McCarthy was not aware that he was committing any offence given that the consent of the victims was present.

Following the appellant's initial arrest in December 2015, an inspection of the premises found adrenaline and lidocaine (prescription-only medicines), evidence that out-of-date products had been used, and an unsanitary environment.

The grounds of appeal and submissions included: that the judge had made an error when ruling that the offences were of such a serious degree that only imprisonment was justified, that insufficient (if any) weight was given to the fact that all the customers had given consent, and that deterrence was too much of an influential factor in the case. Regarding deterrence, Mr Smith (on behalf of the appellant) recognised that there was no need to deter the appellant as he had already shut down his business and the world of body modification was a small one.

The Court found that the judge was correct in stating that Count 1 (removal of the ear) and Count 2 (splitting of the tongue) were serious in the context of GBH, however there was some discrepancy as to whether the removal of the male's nipple met this threshold. The same considerations in regard to the interlocutory appeal were considered and it was concluded that the infliction of consensual GBH is not to be overlooked when sentencing where consent does not offer a defence.

Firstly, the Court identified that there is a general policy imperative of limiting significant violence and protecting the public. Serious injury brings with it disease (and possible death) and can result in a cost for all of society. In addition to this, there is a professional body and structure to govern medically trained personnel and the customers in this case were denied that right. For these reasons, the appeal was dismissed.

Read the full judgement [here](#).

↑ [Back to contents](#)

Richards, R v [2019] EWCA Crim 2238

KEY MESSAGES

- The appellant appealed against his restraining order, which prohibited him from entering Stevenage for 10 years, submitting that it was in breach of his right to a private life under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998.
- The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal, stating the broad restrictions were reasonable and consistent with Article 8.

On 19 November 2018 in St Albans Crown Court, the appellant pleaded guilty on re-arraignment to four counts. Count 1 was on making a threat to kill, contrary to section 16 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. Count 2 concerned sexual assault pursuant to section 3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. Counts 3 and 4 comprised two instances of doing an act tending and intending to pervert the course of public justice contrary to common law.

He was sentenced to an extended sentence of nine years and four months' imprisonment, comprised of a custodial term of five years and four months' imprisonment and an extension period of four years. In addition, he was given a restraining order, current for 10 years, not to directly or indirectly contact his previous partner and not to go to Stevenage.

The appeal concerns the provision of the restraining order prohibiting the appellant from entering Stevenage. It is submitted that this restriction is wrong in principle and disproportionately interferes with the appellant's right to family life, as outlined in Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.

The complainant is a former partner of the appellant and they have two children together. The appellant had an extended history of acting abusively

towards the complainant, causing her to fear for her personal safety. At the time of the events, the appellant was awaiting trial for alleged battery against the complainant.

On 30 March 2018 the complainant received telephone messages and silent calls from a person she believed to be the appellant. At around 1am that night she was in bed with her son when she became aware of a person entering the room through her window. She grabbed the panic alarm that had been installed by the police due to the previous abusive conduct of the appellant. The appellant grabbed the alarm from her and then took her mobile phone.

The appellant started to cuddle the complainant and took their son back into his own bed. The appellant asked the complainant to drop the case against him for battery and told her that he was sorry. With her son in another room, the complainant became concerned that the appellant may become violent. He began to touch the complainant and told her that he had missed her. Before anything could progress the police arrived. The appellant was found hiding in a wardrobe with the panic alarm in his pocket and was arrested.

The appellant had removed the electronic tag that he was required to wear as part of his bail conditions in relation to the earlier battery. This was found at his mother's address.

In interview the appellant explained his presence at the complainant's home was in relation to a phone call telling him their son was ill. He gave the complainant's name as Jane, which was false, and said that she had wanted him to go over. On 14 April the appellant contacted the complainant again and asked her to drop the charges against him.

On 11 June 2018 the appellant was found guilty of the battery charges. A three-year restraining order was imposed upon him. The appellant was subsequently prosecuted for the four offences that form this appeal. In addition, the judge imposed an extended sentence of nine years and four months' imprisonment and a restraining order with a prohibition, for 10 years, upon the appellant going to Stevenage.

The judgement concluded that the broad restrictions were reasonable and consistent with Article 8 and therefore the appeal failed.

Read the full case [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Policing

News

Police leaders start bidding for Tasers

As of 13 January 2020, police and crime commissioners were able to bid for more Tasers for officers. The bidding process is hosted on a new online platform, through which forces decide how much funding they should apply for, based on the threat and risk level in their local area.

During the process, police and crime commissioners need to state how many more officers they intend to train to use Tasers. The final funding allocations will be announced in February.

Read the full article [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Changes to be made to the police complaints and discipline process

On 10 January 2020 new legislation was introduced that will simplify how complaints made against the police are handled. The changes, which came into effect on 1 February, aim to ensure complaints are dealt with quickly, effectively and proportionately, for both the public and the police's benefit.

In addition to these changes, police and crime commissioners will also have a greater role in increasing independence and improving complaints handling.

The changes will make the complaints process more proportionate and encourage a greater emphasis on learning from mistakes. A requirement will be introduced whereby an explanation must be provided where investigations take longer than 12 months after a complaint is made. This is to deliver a more efficient, simpler and quicker investigation process.

Read the full article [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

To tackle ‘county lines’ drug offending, greater collaboration and consistency is needed

HMICFRS’ inspection of how county lines drug trafficking is dealt with at a local, regional and national level, has revealed many incidents of good practice, but an overall need to be more coherent and integrate a system of national tasking, intelligence sharing, and responses.

The report produced post inspection, included the following achievements:

- The establishment of the national county lines co-ordination centre
- Police forces effectively using modern slavery legislation
- Good practice in relation to police bail.

However, the report also highlighted that there was a lack of fully integrated, national response, which resulted in investigations being less effective than they could be. Concerns were also highlighted around organised crime mapping, competing priorities, and the hesitancy to use telecommunication restriction orders.

Read the full report [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Our workforce

Norfolk Constabulary – A need to improve crime recording arrangements

HMICFRS’ re-inspection of Norfolk Constabulary has shown that since the previous, 2014 inspection, numerous crime recording problems have been rectified. Specific improvements noted in the report include:

- The creation and implementation of a crime data integrity plan
- The introduction of an investigation team for incidents which do not require attendance at the crime scene
- The implementation of effective processes for identifying and recording modern slavery offences
- The implementation of a feedback process.

However, the report clearly stated that the force still had many challenges. A particular area of concern, surrounded the fact that the force only records

87.5% of all reported crimes, meaning an estimated 8,700 reports go unrecorded each year. It was recognised that this recording rate stemmed from limited training and poor supervision.

Read the full report [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Suffolk Constabulary – Crime recording improvements

HMICFRS' re-inspection of Suffolk Constabulary has shown that the force has made a 'concerted effort' to improve its number of recorded crimes. It is now estimated that the force records over 90% of all crimes reported to it.

The report highlighted the following improvements:

- The creation and implementation of a crime data integrity plan
- The introduction of a team to ensure compliance with recording rules
- The introduction of a flexible and risk-based audit programme.

However, the report confirmed that the force needs to be recording more reports of crime. Specific concerns included:

- Limited supervision of crime recording decisions
- A failure to record all reports, as appropriate, within 24 hours
- Not appropriately recording reports of crimes received from third parties
- A failure to collect a sufficient amount of diversity information.

It is estimated, that as a result of the above issues, around 5300 reports of all types of crime are not recorded.

Read the full report [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Criminal justice news

New measures introduced to protect victims of stalking

As of 20 January 2020, new Stalking Protection Orders (SPOs) will make it easier for courts to ban stalkers from contacting victims, visiting their homes, or places of work. Additionally, SPOs can place an obligation on a stalker to have to seek professional help for their behaviour.

These orders have been introduced in line with the high statistics released by the Crime Survey which shows that almost one in five women aged over 16 and almost one in ten men, have experienced stalking.

After being placed on an individual, the Orders will usually last for a minimum of 2 years. If the terms of an Order are breached, the individual can receive up to 5 years in prison. Whilst a decision is being made as to whether an SPO should be imposed on an individual, courts will have the power to implement an interim SPO to ensure immediate protection for victims.

Read the full article [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Record high for domestic violence orders

According to the latest official family justice statistics, legal aid changes making it easier for victims of domestic abuse to access legal aid may have contributed to a record number of people seeking help.

Figures from the Ministry of Justice show:

- from July to September 2019, 7,876 applications were made for a domestic violence remedy order
- this figure is up 23% when compared to the same time period in 2018
- this is the highest quarterly figure since statistics were first published in 2009

The government has suggested the increases may be linked to changes in legislation introduced in January 2018.

The campaign group Rights of Women, with support from the Law Society, successfully fought for the removal of the evidence tests to qualify for legal aid that were introduced in April 2013. These tests required victims to provide a prescribed form of evidence to apply for family law legal aid.

Read the full article [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Human trafficking case of Ms A referred to the crown court by the Commission

The conviction of Ms A has been referred to the crown court by the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC). This is in light of a change in law and new evidence that shows it was not in the public interest to prosecute her and that she was a victim of human trafficking both into and within the UK.

Ms A pleaded guilty at Stoke-on-Trent Magistrates' Court on 19 August 2005 to two counts of theft, two counts of dishonestly obtaining communication services, possession of a false instrument (a passport) and obtaining a pecuniary advantage. She was sentenced to 14 months in prison.

After fleeing sexual exploitation and female genital mutilation in her home country, Cameroon, Ms A arrived in the UK in 2003. She was arrested while working in a phone repair shop in 2005. She told police in her interview that she had been threatened into using a false passport to get the job and then into stealing SIM cards belonging to customers.

In 2009 she was granted asylum in the UK. In February 2018, after a referral to the National Referral Mechanism, the Home Office recognised there were conclusive grounds to believe Ms A was a victim of trafficking. This was in relation to being trafficked into the UK for sexual exploitation and trafficked within the UK for sexual exploitation and forced labour.

Ms A's guilty plea meant she did not have an ordinary right to appeal, therefore she applied to the CCRC in relation to her conviction in June 2018. The Commission, after reviewing the case, has decided to refer Ms A's conviction for appeal at the crown court.

The case of *R v GS* [2018] EWCA Crim 1824 identified a new legal argument relating to a change in the law. The referral is based on this change in the law and the fresh evidence as to Ms A's trafficked status. Together, they give rise to the possibility that the crown court will find that it would be an affront to

justice to allow Ms A’s original guilty pleas to stand; that the Crown would decide it was not in the public interest to seek a rehearing; and that an attempt to seek a rehearing would be stayed by the crown court as an abuse of process.

Read the full article [here](#).

↑ Back to contents

Reports and statistics

Operation of police powers under the Terrorism Act 2000 and subsequent legislation: Arrests, Outcomes, and Demographics



Arrests

The 20% decrease continues the downward trend from the previous two years and returns the number of arrests to around the average recorded since 2002. However, the report suggests there was generally a higher volume of arrests between 2011 and 2017 following a previous downward trend between 2006 and 2011.

Outcomes

62 were charged with terrorism-related offences. The following figures show the outcomes following a charge as of 22 October 2019: 27 awaiting prosecution, 24 prosecuted, six other outcomes and five not proceeded against. Other outcomes include cautions, transfers to UK border agencies, the offender being circulated as wanted, and extraditions.

Demographics

Most of those arrested were male (continuing the trend of previous years), with 29 out of the 259 arrests being female (11%). This figure fell by eight from the previous year. Figures for the number of arrests fell for all age groups except across ages 18 to 20, which increased by a single arrest from 29 to 30. As in other years, the '30 and over' age group accounted for the most arrests (58%).

Across all ethnic groups, the number of arrests decreased. Arrests for those of Asian ethnic appearance decreased by 12% in comparison with the previous year (from 109 arrests to 96 arrests). Arrests for people of white ethnic appearance also decreased by 19% (from 131 to 106). There was also a 41% decrease in the number of arrests of people of black ethnic appearance (from 41 arrests to 24).

41% of arrests were of persons of white ethnic appearance, a 1% increase on the previous year. Those of Asian ethnic appearance accounted for 37% of terrorist-related arrests, a 4% increase. The proportion of those arrested who were of black ethnic appearance decreased by 3% to account for 9% of all arrests. Those of 'other' ethnic appearance accounted for 12% of arrests, down 1% on the previous year.

Read the full report [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

Police use of force statistics for England and Wales: April 2018 to March 2019

The latest statistics on incidents where force has been used by police officers were published by the Home Office on 19 December 2019. The report includes type of force, reason the force was used, the outcome, injuries, and demographic information on the subject. The Home Office expresses that the statistics are experimental; they do not represent all use of force across the 43 police forces funded by the Home Office and their accuracy should not be assumed. The key points include:

428,000	Incidents in which a police officer used force
401,000	The number of times restraint tactics (eg, handcuffing) were used
292,000	The number of incidences in which an officer used force to protect themselves
166,000	The number of incidences in which the impact factor was the subject being under the influence of alcohol
309,000	The number of incidents that resulted in the subject's arrest

Overview of use of force incidents

The most common type of force used was restraint tactics. These include handcuffing (compliant or non-compliant), limb/body restraints, and ground restraint. An officer protecting themselves or to assist in making an arrest were the most common reasons force was used. However, in 81% of incidents, multiple reasons for using force were reported. Alcohol was the most common impact factor, with drugs and size/gender/build following closely behind. The most common outcome across all the incidents was the subject being arrested.

Subject details

Subject details as perceived and recorded by the reporting officer:

- 70% perceived as white (299,000)
- 83% perceived as male (356,000)
- 84% perceived as between 18 and 64 years old (361,000)
- 86% of subjects perceived as having no disability (366,000)

Injuries

Of the total number of incidents recorded (428,000), 22,000 (5%) involved reports of the officer sustaining an injury. 200,000 (92%) reported minor injuries (ie, may require some first aid) and 380 (2%) reported severe injury (eg, a fracture, deep cut/laceration or an injury causing damage). The remaining had no injury level recorded.

Of the 428,000 incidents, 25,000 (6%) involved reports of the subject being injured. This included 24,000 (94%) reporting minor injuries and 610 (2%) reporting severe injuries. The remaining include contradictory data or where no injury level was recorded.

There were four reports of the death of a subject, however the Home Office expresses that these figures should not be used to represent the number of deaths caused following police use of force. This is because some deaths may have occurred at a date following the officer completing the form.

Read the full report [here](#).

[↑ Back to contents](#)

About the College

We're the professional body for everyone who works for the police service in England and Wales. Our purpose is to provide those working in policing with the skills and knowledge necessary to prevent crime, protect the public and secure public trust.

college.police.uk



Follow us
@CollegeofPolice