



**Use of Force Scrutiny Panel Meeting  
Monday 28<sup>th</sup> July 2025, 5.30pm – 8.30pm  
Titan Court, Hatfield  
Minutes**

**Attendees**

Chris Cowdrey (Chair)	CC	Anne Griffiths	AG
Andrew Taylor	AT	Valerie Shrimplin	VS
Mohammad Islam Ruman	MIR	Phil Diamond	PD
Russell Dyke	RD	John Gillett	JGi
Elaine Dyke	ED	Zoe Wright	ZW
Martin Jackson	MJ	Nick Rowlands	NR
Tara Bullworthy	TB	Lorraine Edwards	LE
Joanne Godfrey	JGo		
Supt Owen Pyle	Herts Constabulary		OP
Sgt Adrian Pikett	Herts Constabulary		AP
James Coady	OPCC		JC
Lucy Nicolson-James	OPCC		LNJ
Sue McNeill (Minutes)	OPCC		SM

**Also present:** Jamal Pasha & Jubair Ahmed (both observing) and PC Harris

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>
1.1	The Chair (CC) opened the meeting and welcomed the panel, officers and observers, particularly Jamal Pasha and Jubair Ahmed.
1.2	Apologies were noted from Ch Insp Ricky Bartlett, Insp Clare Cray, Lesley MacArthur, Linda Martin, Nicole Moran, Sarah Simons, Godfrey Minsky, Paulette Reed, Nicola Hunt, Dennis Elam, Megan Holland, Daren Power, Eddie McCarroll, Asha Vesudevan and Andrew Hatton.
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes, actions and matters arising from the last meeting</b>
2.1	The minutes of the last meeting were agreed, except for a request by NR to add further detail to one entry to highlight some of the panel’s specific concerns. This information was added and the minutes were recirculated. (Pack item 1.)

2.2	The action tracker (item 2) was circulated prior to the meeting. No Constabulary feedback required on previous month's grading.
2.3	JC advised that the BWV Panel had been disbanded. The office no longer had the capacity to facilitate three separate panels and was in no way a reflection on the panel's work. However, in agreement with both Chairs, elements previously reviewed by the BWV Panel would be captured by this panel. Changes to the feedback sheet to secure this additional information would be subject to review.
<b>3</b>	<b>Use of Force Dip Sampling Feedback: deep dive – Taser</b>
3.1	CC advised the panel that the meeting would focus on taser use during instances involving people from minority ethnic backgrounds. The data subgroup had considered these cases appropriate for deep dive scrutiny prompted by the TASERD report. This was circulated prior to the meeting (item 3.) The selection also included instances where neither the self-defined nor officer-defined ethnicity had been recorded.
3.2	AP explained that where no statement had been submitted by the officer, context was provided by utilising the full justification recorded on the Use of Force form.
3.3	CC reminded that officers were present for operational guidance only. The panel decision should be made prior to asking for advice. The scrutiny took place between 17.50 and 20.05
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Group A</b>
3.4.1	<b>Item 1: Custody</b> Panel members felt placing a hand on the detainee's shoulder could have been antagonistic. The female officer gained good rapport. Handcuffs were removed at the earliest opportunity. Officers were careful with the detainee's head when being put into the cell. An excellent statement of events was provided. <b>Green 1</b>
3.4.2	<b>Item 2: Taser</b> No announcement of 'officer with taser' made. No announcement of the incident being videoed even though there was time for this to have been said. <b>Green 2</b>
3.4.3	<b>Item 3: Taser</b> A good statement was provided. The officer's conduct was excellent, taking into account the language barrier. Officers checked the detainee's head wound. <b>Green 1</b>

3.4.4	<p><b>Item 4: Taser</b></p> <p>Engagement was reasonable in the circumstances. The Constabulary asked the Operational Strategy Team (OST) to review the incident with respect to training. Officer carefully considered not using the taser because it could have been dangerous as the driver left the scene. <b>Green 1</b></p>
3.4.5	<p><b>Item 5: Taser</b></p> <p>Panel thought that the incident was managed fairly due to the allegation that the detainee was in possession of a weapon. The report may have been misleading in that the risk to others was low. Due to the possibility of there being a weapon, this risk could be higher in the statement. Officers were excellent, calm and communicative. There was clear communication with Control Room staff. This was exemplary. <b>Green 1</b></p>
3.4.6	<p><b>Item 6: Taser</b></p> <p>There was some confusion at the start of the footage as two officers were shouting instructions at the same time. The use of force felt premature. The National Decision Model (NDM) statement worked well. <b>Green 1</b></p>
<b>3.5 Group B</b>	
3.5.1	<p><b>Item 7: Taser</b></p> <p>Good clear communications and instructions given by officers who spoke calmly and supported the individual in standing. The individual offered no resistance. <b>Green 1</b></p>
3.5.2	<p><b>Item 8: Taser</b></p> <p>Good concise report, clean arrest, no issues. <b>Green 1</b></p>
3.5.3	<p><b>Item 9: Taser</b></p> <p>Clear instructions given. The statement was very detailed but demonstrated knowledge of legislation. The panel felt that the report was longer than needed and would have taken a considerable length of time to write. <b>Green 1</b></p>
3.5.4	<p><b>Item 10: Taser</b></p> <p>The use of force/taser was justified and proportionate. Another officer attending the incident swore which the panel felt was inappropriate but did not detract from the grade given for the use of force deployed. <b>Green 1</b></p>

3.5.5	<p><b>Item 11: Taser</b></p> <p>The panel was interested to know (perhaps from the perspective of another officer’s footage) why the officer took the detainee to the ground when the individual looked as if to stop with hands up. The suspect, however, did not stop on hearing the officer shout ‘taser.’ The use of taser was appropriate. The use of handcuffs was not graded by the panel but there appeared to be no obvious misuse. <b>Green 1</b></p> <p><b>Action: AP to source additional footage</b></p>
3.5.6	<p><b>Item 11: Taser</b></p> <p>Clear communications. <b>Green 1</b></p>
3.6	<p><b>General comments:</b> Having viewed the footage, on occasion, the panel was unsure why ethnicity was not recorded when it appeared obvious during the engagement. However, there appeared to be no difference in the way ethnic groups were treated by officers when taser used or subject ‘red-dotted.’</p>
3.7	<p>During a subgroup discussion, a question was raised relating to policy-making and enforcement, particularly in respect of announcing the recording of incidents. OP quoted sections of the policy and agreed to circulate the wording to the whole panel for clarification.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: the wording was included in email dated 7.8.25 circulating these minutes.</i></p>
3.8	<p>A further sub-group discussion related to the policy for footage retention, with a request that this be discussed at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Action: BWV footage retention policy to be added to agenda</b></p>
3.9	<p>The panel discussed the revised feedback form, and it was agreed that certain elements would be removed, particularly in respect of the clarified regulations regarding the use of BWV equipment.</p> <p><b>Action: OPCC to revise the form ahead of the next meeting.</b></p>
4	<p><b>Chair and OPCC Updates</b></p>
4.1	<p><b>OPCC update:</b> JC advised the panel that he was leaving the OPCC and this would be his last meeting. Both CC and OP thanked him on behalf of the panel and Constabulary respectively for the support and commitment to ensuring meaningful scrutiny.</p>
4.2	<p><b>Constabulary update:</b> OP advised the panel that the Constabulary was undergoing restructure, which has resulted in the Operational Strategy Team being disbanded (in September 2025.) The panel will continue to be supported by Insp Cray and Sgt Pikett but</p>

	under the management of Local Policing Command. Under the new model, OP will move away from his current role, therefore this would also be his last meeting. Again, CC and JC asked for thanks to be formally recorded.
<b>5</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>
5.1	Discussion followed regarding evening meetings generally, and specifically in respect of the January online meeting. The panel agreed that this would be an appropriate meeting to hold in the evening. <i>Post-meeting note: on 29.7.25, the January invites were amended to reflect this decision.</i>
5.2	No other items were raised. CC closed the meeting.
<b>6</b>	<b>Date of next meeting:</b> Wednesday 24 <sup>th</sup> September 2025, 14:00-17:00 Three Rivers District Council (3 Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth WD3 1RL)