

Days from receipt to completion	Summary of allegation(s)	Complaint Category and type	Complaint Outcome (Humberside Police)	Review Outcome (LPB)	Recommendations to Force	Force response to Recommendation
10 days	<p>1. The complainant alleges that they were wrongfully arrested</p> <p>2. The complainant is dissatisfied with a lack of contact from an officer.</p>	<p>B. Police powers, policies and procedures. B3 Power to arrest and detain</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services A1 Police action following contact</p>	<p>The service provided was acceptable.</p> <p>Unable to determine whether the service was acceptable or not.</p>	Not reasonable & Proportionate Upheld	That the DS makes enquiries into the arrest of the complainant for an offence of breaching a restraining order, as described, and provides the complainant with an explanation of the circumstances of that. If, after all, it appears that the correct offence has already been reviewed then the complainant should have that explained to them. A conversation with the complainant may help correct any misunderstandings so far.	Accepted
8 days	The complainant states that they wished to pursue a business operating a website offering for sale firearms belonging to licensed third parties, and the Humberside Police Firearms Licensing Department are refusing to allow them to operate a website without a dealer's authorisation. They state that this refusal has deprived them of a substantial income and they require financial compensation.	A. Delivery of duties and services. A1 Police action following contact	The service provided was acceptable.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
9 days	<p>1. The complainants allege that in relation to a matter for which they went to court and were found not guilty, the person who was recorded as the victim was never investigated as a suspect despite them wanting this to happen.</p> <p>2. The complainant allege that a police report sent to the Crown Prosecution Service to determine whether or not they should be charged was inaccurate.</p> <p>3. The complainant is dissatisfied with numerous aspects concerning the investigation into an incident where they were noted as being the suspect.</p> <p>4. The complainant alleges that a person is trying to pervert the course of justice and police are not following the correct protocol, in relation to a photograph entered into a jury bundle.</p>	<p>A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services. A3 Information</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services A4 General level of service</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services A4 General level of service</p>	<p>1. The service provided was not acceptable</p> <p>2. The service provided was not acceptable</p> <p>3. Unable to determine whether the service was acceptable or not.</p>	Not reasonable & Proportionate Upheld	<p>1) An apology is given by the force for the lack of engagement during the complaint handling.</p> <p>2) A manager in Humberside Police to provide a written reply to clarify the outstanding questions not addressed during the complaint handling as mentioned above in this report: > Does Humberside Police accept that they did not provide accurate information to the CPS on whether or not X was injured? > Does Humberside Police acknowledge that that there was no blood or DNA evidence that showed contact between X and X? > Was BWV footage from PC X actually sent to CPS?</p> <p>3) The outcome for complaint allegation 3, to be changed to the 'service was not acceptable'.</p> <p>4) I note that the officer is to receive training and have a supervisor discussion to address identified under-performance. I ask that a manager in PSD consider formalising this as Practice Requiring Improvement and refer the officer for Reflective Practise Review Process due to the nature of the failings.</p>	Accepted
10 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with how police have dealt with their daughter and have failed to safeguard her.	A. Delivery of duties and services A1 Police action following contact	The service provided was acceptable Explanation provided	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

22 days	<p>1. The complainant is dissatisfied with the investigation and outcome of a theft of motor vehicle that was reported to the police including an alleged lack of supervisory oversight.</p> <p>2. The complainant is dissatisfied with a lack of communication prior to an investigation report being filed.</p>	<p>A. Delivery of duties and services A1 Police action following contact</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services A4 General level of service</p>	<p>The service provided was acceptable. Explanation provided</p> <p>Not determined whether the service provided was acceptable.</p>	Not reasonable & Proportionate Upheld	Re-opening the case in relation to theft of car and make arrangements to interview the alleged offender under criminal caution. If the force follows this course of action, they should keep both X and the force Legal Services Unit (LSU) updated on progress. This will allow the LSU to decide if it is necessary to stay the civil proceedings whilst the work takes place. The person who purports to be an innocent purchaser of the car should also be updated on the developments to allow them to properly prepare for the civil action to decide 'title' to the car.	Not Accepted.
4 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with how police have dealt with hate incidents where they are the victim.	A. Delivery of duties and services A1 Police action following contact	Not determined if the service was acceptable.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
49 days	<p>1. The complainant alleges that they were wrongfully arrested.</p> <p>2. The complainant is dissatisfied with how a theft, where he was the victim, was dealt with.</p>	<p>B. Police powers, policies and procedures B3 Power to arrest and detain.</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services A1 Police action following contact</p>	<p>The service provided was acceptable. Explanation provided</p> <p>The service provided was acceptable. Explanation provided</p>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
45 days	<p>1. The complainant is dissatisfied that he was unable to get through to a contact officer via 101 to report a number of tractors driving without number plates.</p> <p>2. The complainant alleges that there is no roads policing in the Driffield area.</p>	<p>A. Delivery of duties and services. A4 General level of service</p> <p>E. Use of police vehicles.</p>	<p>The service provided was acceptable. Explanation and apology provided.</p> <p>The service provided was acceptable. Explanation provided.</p>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
40 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the investigation and outcome of an incident where they were the victim of an assault.	A. Delivery of duties and services. A4 General level of service.	It was not determined if the service was acceptable. Explanation provided.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
27 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with numerous aspects of their time in custody including not being given medication, not checked to see if they were fit to be interviewed and no advice asked about tablets or needs.	B. Police powers, policies and procedures. B5 Detention in police custody	It was not determined if the service was acceptable. Explanation provided.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
17 days	<p>1. The complainant is dissatisfied with how Humberside Police have dealt with a breach of a restraining order where they are the victim.</p> <p>2. The complainant is dissatisfied with how Humberside Police have dealt with numerous issues concerning a neighbour.</p>	<p>A. Delivery of duties and services. A4 General level of service.</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services. A4 General level of service</p>	<p>Not determined if the service was acceptable.</p> <p>Not determined if the service was acceptable. Explanation provided</p>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
19 Days	<p>1. The complainant alleged that during their arrest, they received injuries namely bruising to their wrist and arms from Humberside Police officers using excessive force.</p> <p>2. The complainant alleged that whilst under arrest and being treated at Hull Royal Infirmary, they used the toilet where they were observed by a male officer, their handcuffs were not removed.</p>	<p>B. Police Powers, Policies and procedures B4 Use of force</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services A4 General level of service</p>	<p>The service provided was acceptable. Explanation provided</p> <p>The service provided was acceptable Explanation provided</p>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

19 Days	Alleged unfair and discriminatory treatment by Humberside Firearms Licensing Office as a result of making a complaint via the police complaints system.	H. Individual Behaviour H5 Overbearing or harassing behaviours	The service provided was acceptable.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
18 Days	The complainant is dissatisfied with a lack of contact from police following them being the victim of crime.	A. Delivery of duties and services. A4 General level of service	The service provided was acceptable. Explanation provided.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
16 Days	<p>1. The complainant is dissatisfied that an off duty member of police staff attended their late fathers address without prior warning. Whilst at the address they had a conversation with the complainants mother, who was caused to feel intimidated and threatened by her body language and general manner, which she deemed to be aggressive. Also that whilst at the address they had not conformed to COVID guidance regarding social distancing and wearing of masks.</p> <p>2. The complainant is dissatisfied with an off duty member of police staff for sending correspondence from their solicitor which allege unfounded accusations about the complainants mother residing in the complainants late father's house and demanding her to leave the address within 14 days. They also accused the complainant of preventing them access to the property and making arrangements to collect a pet cat which they had no legal right to.</p> <p>3. The complainant is dissatisfied with an off duty member of police staff and an off duty police officer who had gained access to the address with keys that they had in their possession, without authority to enter the property. They also allegedly took the alarm code without permission and accessed the property, setting the alarm off. They didn't return the keys when asked to by the complainants solicitor.</p>	<p>H. Individual Behaviour H5 Overbearing or harassing behaviours</p> <p>H. Individual Behaviour H5 Overbearing or harassing behaviours</p> <p>H. Individual Behaviour H5 Overbearing or harassing behaviours</p>	The service provided was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
14 Days	The complainant alleges that officers from the Central Ticket Office have harassed and bullied them and have emailed veiled threats to coerce them into accepting responsibility for something which is nothing to do with them.	H. Individual Behaviour H5 Overbearing or harassing behaviours	The service provided was acceptable. Explanation provided	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

<p>13 Days</p>	<p>1. Dissatisfaction regarding their arrest by Humberside officers as unlawful with no reasonable grounds to suspect they were involved in the offence and in any event they would have attended voluntarily.</p> <p>2. Dissatisfaction regarding unlawful detention following arrest by Humberside Police officers re the allegation of attempted child abduction.</p> <p>3. Dissatisfaction regarding the unlawful damage by Humberside Police to his property, following a search.</p> <p>4. Dissatisfaction regarding failure of Humberside officers to investigate photos of them which were uploaded to Facebook by the parents of the victim.</p>	<p>B. Police powers, policies and procedures B3 Power to arrest and detain.</p> <p>B. Police powers, policies and procedures B5 Detention in police custody</p> <p>B. Police powers, policies and procedures B3 Searches of premises and seizure of property</p> <p>A. Delivery of duties and services A4 General level of service</p>	<p>The service provided was acceptable Explanation provided</p> <p>The service provided was acceptable Explanation provided</p> <p>Unable to determine if the service was acceptable Apology provided</p> <p>The service provided was acceptable Explanation provided</p>	<p>Not reasonable & Proportionate Upheld</p>	<p>1) Make further enquiries into the circumstances of the alleged damage to property, by checking relevant records and, if considered appropriate, speaking with the officers conducting the search. The complainant should then be given details of the work carried out and the correct outcome, deriving from the work, with a full explanation.</p> <p>2) Give a clearer explanation to the complainant in relation to Allegation 4 after a re-visit of the work carried out by the complaint handler and the outcome. From the documents available to the reviewer, they believe that sufficient work has gone into the complaint handling for this allegation but the outcome is unclear. The complaint handler seems to have checked the circumstances and the law, and has spoken with the officers concerned. As part of the re-visit of this allegation, X should be asked to provide details of the contact they refer to in the review request suggesting communication with an unnamed officer which contradicts the dates given in the outcome letter.</p> <p>Should the force carry out these two extra pieces of work, an explanatory letter should then be sent to the complainant with any revised outcome for these two allegations.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
----------------	---	--	---	--	--	-----------------