Days from receipt to	Summary of allegation(s)	Complaint Category and type	Complaint Outcome (Humberside Police)	Review Outcome (LPB)	Recommendations to Force	Force response to Recommendation
completion						
Reporting Peri	iod - 2021/22 - Quarter 2				•	
18 days	The complainant alleges that when arrested the officers weren't interested in their side of the story or any of the neighbours statements. They were then put in a cell for 18 hours with no charges brought against them.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Not R&P Upheld	<ol> <li>The Force to conduct further work to clarify the necessity for the arrest, in the circumstances set out, and the period in custody.</li> <li>On completion of the extra work, the complainant should be given a full explanation of the findings.</li> </ol>	Accepted
5 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that officers damaged their back gate, the back door and the back wall next to the back gate and on leaving the property have left it insecure.	B. Police Powers, Policies and Procedures B2 Searches of premises and seizure of property	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
17 days	The complainant alleges that whilst Humberside Police had their phone it was connected to the internet on numerous occasions unneccessarily and without their authorisation	B. Police Powers, Policies and Procedures B7 Evidential Procedures	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
17 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with numerous aspects concerning how a police log was dealt with.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
15 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the investigation and outcome of a reported crime where they are the victim.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
21 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with being told to call 101 instead of 999 as other people were waiting and then had to wait in the queue.	A. Delivery of duties and Services A4 General level of service	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
28 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the investigation and outcome of an investigation into a robbery where they were the victim.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
37 days	1. The complainant is dissatisfied with how police have dealt with the removal of a glider from their land.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied that officers did not stop trespassers who came onto their land.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact				
30 days	The complainant rang the police reporting ongoing harassment from their partner's ex-partner and was dissatisfied with the call taker stating they were unhelpful. The complainant expressed their dissatisfaction about that call and that police are not taking the stalking seriously.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

30 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with a police operation and warrant executed at his address. They believe the police presence was excessive, and is dissatisfied with how they were subsequently treated.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Upheld	<ol> <li>A manager in Humberside Police Professional Standards Department formally writes to the complainant apologising for the information about the improvement notice for machinery at their farm being contained in the outcome letter, when it could not be confirmed to be true. The letter should therefore also formally confirm that the comment is now withdrawn.</li> <li>Any record held on police information systems in relation to the improvement notice is corrected or removed.</li> <li>I ask that the complainant's positive comments about the Chief Inspector's complaint handling be shared with them, and they are also reminded of the need to ensure the accuracy of information in formal reports. The latter refers to what they wrote about</li> </ol>	Accepted
18 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that the police have not attended to obtain CCTV in relation to a report of assault on them by their neighbour.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
27 days	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied with how police are dealing with anti-social behaviour in their area.</li> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied with the outcome of a criminal investigation where they are the victim.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable Explanation provided	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
27 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that they were given a relative's address in July 2021 but was not given them in March 2021 when they asked.	D. Access and/or disclosure of information. D2. Disclosure of information.	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
10 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the outcome of an investigation into an alleged fraud where they allege that their employer defrauded them of monies.	A. Delivery of duties and services. A2. Decisions	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
25 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that they have not been given the opportunity to provide a formal disclosure regarding historic offences in an investigation where the suspect is deceased.	A. Delivery of duties and services. A2. Decisions	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
26 days	<ol> <li>The complainant alleges that officers have failed to reply to their requests to be contacted.</li> <li>The complainant alleges that officers are failing to deal with antisocial behaviour and harassment in a proper manner.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact A. Delivery of duties and services. A4. General level of service.	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

20 days	The complainant states they have provided information to the Humberside Police Firearms Licensing Department which has not been acted upon.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable		<ol> <li>A manager or supervisor from Humberside Police Firearms and Explosives Licensing Unit provide an explanation as to why the two websites in question are not breaking the law, as the complainant alleges, and why they do not need to be investigated, OR,</li> <li>If that is not possible, they should forward on the e- mails where the complainant raises his concerns to their equivalent units in Wiltshire and Sussex. I am not recommending that they endorse or support the complainant's views, I am simply recommending that they pass on his email raising the concerns to those units that do have jurisdiction over the websites to deal with as they see fit.</li> <li>Once either 1 or 2 has been completed as appropriate, a letter is sent to the complainant telling him that Humberside Police will not entertain any further communication on these matters. They will either be closed, or they can be contacted by the two forces in question directly as they deem appropriate</li> </ol>	Accepted
18 days	The complaint is that officers forced entry to the complainant's property causing damage to the door and door frame beyond repair when it could be checked that the wanted person was at a probation appointment and GPRS enabled tag.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable Explanation provided	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
16 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with how they were dealt with by a Police Community Support Officer at their home address on and states that the officer put pressure on them to see a doctor, trying to tell them they are mentally unwell which they find abusive, an insult, discriminatory and unprofessional.	H. Individual Behaviour H3 Unprofessional attitude and disrespect	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
29 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with police actions which are and have been taken in relation to protecting their 17 year old daughter who is vulnerable.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
28 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that the police have refused to take a statement from a victim regarding a pervert the course of justice allegation.	A. Delivery of duties and Services A4 General level of service	Service provided by Police was acceptable Explanation provided	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
18 days	The complainant alleges that the male officers who put them into the back of a police van used force which was inappropriate, unjustified and unlawful.	<ul> <li>B. Police powers, policies and procedures</li> <li>B4 Use of Force</li> </ul>	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
19 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the legal services department who have not progressed their compensation claim regarding their mobile telephone which was destroyed by police.	C. Handling of or damage to property/premises C - N/A	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Not reasonable & Proportionate Upheld	N/A	N/A
18 days	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied that officers attended their property to speak to them about what they consider to be a trivial matter.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A2 Decisions	Service provided by Police was in the main acceptable. Explanation/apology provided	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
	<ol><li>The complainant alleges that the officer who visited them had no manners when speaking to</li></ol>	A. Delivery of duties and services. A4. General level of service.				

14 days	1. The complainant is alleging that an officer has recklessly placed handcuffs on them causing bruising and nerve damage to their hand.	B. Police powers, policies and procedures B4 Use of Force	1. Service provided by Police was acceptable.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
	2. The complainant is alleging that the police officers were disrespectful and abusive towards them, swearing specifically.	A. Delivery of duties and services. A4. General level of service.	<ol> <li>Service provided by Police was acceptable.</li> <li>Explanation/apology provided.</li> </ol>			
14 days	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied with how the Officer has investigated the ongoing neighbour dispute.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A2 Decisions	<ol> <li>Service provided by Police was acceptable.</li> <li>Explanation provided.</li> </ol>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied they have been issued with a Community Protection Warning which they do not accept.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of duties and services. A1 Police action following contact.	<ol> <li>Service provided by Police was acceptable.</li> <li>Explanation provided.</li> </ol>			
19 days	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied with the level of protection gained from the Police as they felt that an alleged crime was not properly investigated or dealt with correctly.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of duties and Services A4 General level of service	<ol> <li>Service provided by Police was acceptable.</li> <li>Explanation provided.</li> </ol>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied they received a letter from the OIC which had a different name on, not the complainant's and states this is a data protection breach.</li> </ol>	D. Access and/or disclosure of information. D2. Disclosure of information.	<ol> <li>Service provided by Police was not acceptable.</li> <li>Apology/acknowledgement something went wrong</li> </ol>			
26 days	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied that Police have not taken their reports about the neighbours seriously.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of duties and services A4 General level of service	1. Service provided by Police was acceptable. Explanation provided.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied the NPT have failed to make any contact/update the complainant.</li> </ol>	A. Delivery of duties and services A4 General level of service	2. Service provided by Police was acceptable. Explanation provided.			
25 days	The complainant alleges that officers have ignored abuse shouted to them after they were arrested and should have arrested a person for this.	A. Delivery of duties and services A1 Police Action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable. Explanation provided.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
24 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the response of Humberside Police following them reporting a burglary at their address.	A. Delivery of duties and services A1 Police Action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable. Explanation provided.	Not reasonable & Proportionate Upheld	Arrangements be made for a supervisor from the local Neighbourhood Policing Unit to personally visit the complainant to apologise on behalf of the force. At this stage it is unlikely that any further opportunities exist to investigate the burglary, but that supervisor can re-assess that having spoken to the complainant.	Accepted
7 days	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied that a police vehicle was exceeding the speed limit when crossing the flyover on the A180, Grimsby.</li> </ol>	E. Use of Police Vehicles	<ol> <li>Service provided by Police was acceptable.</li> <li>Explanation provided.</li> </ol>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
	<ol> <li>The complainant is dissatisfied with having been issued with a speeding ticket and believes his having been issued with one is unfair.</li> </ol>	B. Police Powers, policies and procedures. B7. Evidential Procedures	2. Service provided by Police was acceptable. Explanation provided.			
16 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with their arrest and	B. Police powers, policies and procedures.	Service provided by Police was acceptable.	Reasonable & Proportionate	N/A	N/A

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED