

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
Reporting Period - 2020/21 Q4						
14 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with how they have been spoken to by officers who have engaged with them.	Individual behaviour Impolite and intolerant actions	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
7 days	1. The complainant alleges officers were disrespectful to them and their son who was arrested. 2. The complainant alleges the officers were heavy handed when arresting their son. 3. The complainant alleges an officer was rude towards them, calling them 'madam' in a sarcastic tone.	1. Individual behaviour Impolite and intolerant actions 2. Police powers, policies and procedures Use of Force 3. Individual behaviour Language and tone	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
7 days	1. The complainant is dissatisfied with numerous aspects of their contact with Humberside Police over the years, including it's structure and processes; police letting them down; the outcome of numerous incidents and complaints they have made; that a female officer was allowed to walk down the street alone when they perceived a threat to her; nobody ever being tracked down for anything they have reported; and wanting police to be with them when they go to places.	1. Delivery of duties and services General level of service	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
6 days	1. The complainant is dissatisfied with how an officer has dealt with them following an issue with a neighbour where they state threats to kill were made. They say the officer was rude and did not wear a face mask. 2. The complainant alleges that an officer has passed on personal details about them to third parties. 3. The complainant alleges that an officer has failed to deal with an issue they reported in 2019.	1. Individual behaviour Impolite and intolerant actions 2. Access and/or disclosure of information Disclosure of information 3. Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable Explanation provided	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
8 days	1. The complainant alleges police have dealt with their report of a covid breach by neighbours without proper scrutiny and disregarded the law in relation to Public Health. They state that the level of service provided to them has been inadequate and the police have lacked transparency in not divulging the reasons or rationale why two households are under the same roof.	Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
7 days	1. The complainant is dissatisfied that an officer advised them they could be charged with perverting the course of justice as a result of them retracting a statement they provided to the police.	Individual Behaviour Unprofessional Attitude and disrespect	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
4 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the police response following them being assaulted.	Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a

16 days	The complainant is dissatisfied the police have failed to record their harrassment	Police powers, policies and procedures Decisions	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
8 days	1. The complainant is dissatisfied with how Humberside Police have dealt with a sexual offence which they reported in 2008, including why this never went to charge. 2. The complainant is dissatisfied with the conclusions made by a Humberside Police employee who took a statement from them over a two day period in 2008.	1. Delivery of duties and services General level of service 2. Delivery of duties and services General level of service	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
8 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that police keep attending their address after their ex-partner makes allegations against them.	Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	No	n/a
8 days	The complainant alleges that police made a mistake sending their letters to a different address. The complainant didn't receive the letters and ended up with points on their licence, a fine and was suspended from work, all due to the police's mistake.	Delivery of duties and services Information	Service provided by police was acceptable	Not R&P Upheld	That Humberside Police consider writing to xxxx and explain the exact situation and clarify if the conviction can be re-visited, whether or not a mistake was made with his address by the police.	Accepted
22 days	1. The complainant alleges that the officer who attended a report of an illegal hunt did not understand the law in relation to the Hunting Act. 2. The complainant alleges that the officers who attended a report of an illegal hunt conducted a biased investigation by taking the word of the hunt participants over their word. 3. The complainant alleges that an officer who attended a report of an illegal hunt took down their face covering when speaking to them, and they allege that she spoke in a stand-offish manner. 4. The complainant alleges that officers who attended a report of an illegal hunt did not act when they pointed out that the hunt participants were not social distancing.	1. Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact 2. Delivery of duties and services Lack of fairness and impartiality 3. Delivery of duties and services Impolite and intolerant actions 4. Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable	Not R&P Upheld	That Humberside Police consider: a) Defining the actions of PC's xxxx and xxxx as Practice Requiring Improvement (PRI) and refer it to be dealt with by Reflective Practice Review Process (RPRP). b) Defining Inspector xxxx's complaint handling and assessment of his officers actions also as PRI and appropriate for RPRP. c) Providing the complainant with a meaningful apology for the service provided by PC's xxxx and xxxx not being acceptable, and also for the failings in Inspector xxxx's complaint handling. d) Commissioning a piece of work by a member of Humberside Police staff, to seek engagement will all parties in this incident to bring greater cooperation and understanding, allowing them to follow their varying lawful pursuits. This would also have the positive impact of bringing transparency to the policing and reduce the need for untrained police resources to be deployed on a recurring basis.	Accepted
2 days	The complainant alleges that they called the police to an ongoing domestic incident, but when the police attended their house first about the noise reported from there, the police said they would also visit next door but they went direct to the police car and left.	Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

7 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the police response to, and conduct and negligence during the investigation into stalking, coercive control and domestic abuse towards them and their son by their ex spouse.	Delivery of duties and services General level of service	Service provided by police was acceptable	Not R&P Upheld	That Humberside Police consider: a) Making arrangements for a face-to-face meeting between the complainant, DS xxxxx and DI xxxxx, as outlined within the Review Report, where they can receive full answers to all their questions. b) Offering an apology to the complainant for failings in the investigation of the allegations against their ex-spouse, and also the unduly long period taken to handle this complaint. c) Assessing the time taken for the complaint handling by DI xxxxx and the quality of it, and considering whether the time taken or quality of the work amounts to PRI for them. If so, they should be referred for RPRP, on the basis that, if they had the complaint from an early stage, the handling was unjustifiably long, did not address all the original issues and does not seem to have included engagement with the complainant to understand her complaint. Such failings can undermine public confidence in the police complaints system. They have generated corrective action in a positive way, to their credit, but that does not justify the time taken and seems to go against the outcome given. d) Changing the outcome for the complaint to 'the service delivered by Humberside Police was not acceptable'.	Accepted
22 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that CCTV footage and still photographs have not been placed on Hull Live without the faces being blurred out.	Delivery of duties and services General level of service	Service provided by police was acceptable	Upheld	That Humberside Police consider: a) Ensuring the CCTV footage and stills are provided in an 'unblurred' format to Hull Live for publication on the site, or b) If it should be the case that this is not possible for legal or other reasons, that the complainant is given a proper full explanation of why it is so.	Accepted
22 days	The complainant alleges Humberside Police are harassing them due to them having mental health issues because the Police were banging on their door at 0130 hrs, allegedly in connection with a missing person. When they phoned the Police they were told the Officers would re-attend to speak to them but no-one did.	Discriminatory Behaviour Disability	Unable to determine whether the service was acceptable or not	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
16 days	1. The complainant is dissatisfied with how police have dealt with an investigation where they were a suspect. 2. The complainant is dissatisfied with the advice given to them and how they were spoken to by an officer in the Force Control Room.	1. Delivery of duties and services General level of service 2. Individual behaviour Impolite and intolerant actions	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
19 days	1. The complainant alleges that on ***** at Clough Road Police Station they were questioned and refused contact with a lawyer. 2. The complainant alleges that on ***** at Clough Road Police Station they were laughed at by a policewoman.	1. Police powers, policies and procedures Bail, identification and interview procedures 2. Individual behaviour Unprofessional attitude and disrespect	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A