



Derbyshire Constabulary Independent Advisory Group

Use of Force Taser Scrutiny Meeting

Date: Wednesday 9th May 2026

Attendance Police

Pete Moss – Chief Taser Instructor (PM)

Police Constable Louisa Briscoe - Deputy Chief Taser Instructor (LB)

Heather Cunningham – Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Compliance Officer (HC)

Independent members

KH - Independent member

CH - Independent member

ED - Independent member

CB - Independent member

Apologies

JA - Independent member

TC - Independent member

BC - Independent member

AT - Independent member

CJ-B - Independent member

LN - Independent member

Welcome and Introductions

This meeting was held virtually via Microsoft Teams, but the facility was also there for Independent Advisory Group (IAG) members to attend a local police station in person if they wished so that HC could facilitate their participation in the online meeting.

In the absence of the chair and vice chair, HC welcomed all attendees to the meeting and invited attendees to introduce themselves by name. HC reminded independent members of the confidentiality agreement they had signed, and that independent members (IMs) should be respectful of each other's views even if they differed from their own.



PM explained that the Policing Powers Tactical Board requested the panel reviewed cases that involved a subject who identified as Black Heritage. PM presented the cases and the Body Worn Video (BWV). PM was present to answer questions and provide an explanation for the procedure and training for tasers. PM explained that there were fifty incidents involving a taser and a subject who identified as Black heritage in the period 31/07/2025 – 06/05/2026. PM randomly selected five cases from the fifty cases to present to the panel.

The cases presented were randomly selected. PM explained that he captured a summary from the chronicle forms that officers complete for use of force.

Independent Members (IMs) were asked to consider the following three questions when reviewing the cases:

1. From viewing the CCTV or Body Worn Video did the use of force viewed have a legal basis?
2. Do you have any comments on the interaction between the detained person and officer?

These minutes contain numerous abbreviations. A description of them is explained below.

BWV – Body Worn Video

CCTV - Closed-Circuit Television

DP - Detained person

IAG – Independent Advisory Group

IM – Independent Member

RPU – Roads Policing Unit

Feedback from previous meeting

There was no comments raised by IMs from the previous meeting.

1) Use of Police Powers Scrutiny

Case 1:

Date	19/04/2026
Time	22:35
Location	Derby City
Subject	Male Black 31 – 64 years old
Type of force used	Taser – red dot; handcuffing to the rear.
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Moderator effects - Psychological



	Weapon – Glass bottle
Incident summary	Officers were called to an incident whereby an outstanding male had returned to a location where he had earlier committed criminal damage by smashing and breaking a door with his crutch earlier in the day. Officers attended as he was back on scene and needed to effect an arrest, they attended and spoke to subject who became aggressive and had a glass on his person. He became verbal and threatened officers, he then raised his glass and it was believed he was going to throw it at officers. He was therefore red dotted and dropped the glass, he was then taken to the floor by other officers and arrested.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested.
Body Worn Video	Yes.
Panel Observations	An IM asked if the Detained Person (DP) had been tasered, because they were not sure if they had seen this happen on the BWV clip because the incident happened so quickly. PM confirmed that the DP was not tasered but was red dotted. An IM commented that they understood that an officer can use reasonable force to protect themselves and others. An IM commented that from viewing the BWV, it was their opinion that the DP didn't appear to raise their hand as if he was going to throw the glass at the officers, and therefore in their opinion the DP was not such a risk that the officer needed to use their taser. An IM raised a concern around proportionality with their being 5 officers present for one subject. An IM commented that it was their opinion that the number of police officers seen on the BWV to be present at the incident escalated the incident. However, the IM



	commented that they felt the number of officers was needed particularly after watching the video and seeing how many officers were needed to restrain the DP safely. The IM felt that the red dot did the job, without having to escalate to a higher use of force. An IM felt after viewing the BWV the number of officers was proportionate and that the red dot did the job and in their opinion the DP was threatening towards the officers. An IM commented that the officer whose BWV the group were viewing was in their opinion antagonising the DP. The IM commented that the officer did a good job of backing away from the DP once they had been secured and allowed the other officers present to do their job. PM explained that the DP could be seen on the BWV to respond aggressively to the police van arriving and it was at this point that the DP withdrew the bottle from their pocket. PM explained that the officer does not have to wait for the DP to throw a glass and can use common law to justify the use of force. The IM commented that in their opinion from viewing the BWV that the DP was aggressive and abusive, and that the officers handled the incident well. The IM had thought the DP was initially tasered, but acknowledged that they now understood the DP had been red dotted. The IM questioned whether the DP taking the bottle out of their pocket, was enough to have tasered him. PM acknowledged that had the officer tasered the DP it may have been questionable, but ultimately it was a decision made and justified by the officer's personal risk assessment and a justification has to be provided by the officer on their use of force record.
--	--



	An IM commented they felt it was well handled and the safest way for everyone in the way that the circumstances were dealt with. PM commented on the officer's tactical comms, and acknowledged the officer moved herself to prevent continuing to antagonise the DP. Police Constable LB, highlighted that from viewing the BWV it was clear that the officers knew the DP, and that the officers have a duty of care to protect the DP from hurting himself. PM highlighted that the number of officers present helps manage and reduce the risk to officers and the DP. An IM commented it was their opinion that the officers handled the situation well, keeping the situation calm and trying to de-escalate the situation. The IM noted that although there were a lot of officers present, the officers could be seen on the BWV to be keeping distance between themselves and the DP. The IM commented it was their opinion that this helped prevent the DP from feeling surrounded and trapped. An IM commented how impressive it was that within a split second the officers worked as a team to take control of the situation. And commented on how the officer used their communication to deescalate the situation.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that there was a clear legal basis for the use of force. BWV provided evidence of compliance. IMs commented on the good use of tactical communication, and the teamwork between the officers to gain control of the incident.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be shared with officers and their supervisors.



Case 2:

Date	03/03/2026
Time	13:33
Location	Derby City
Subject	Male Black 18 – 30 years old
Type of force used	Taser – withdrawn; handcuffing to the rear
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Moderator effects – Drugs Weapon – Knife
Incident summary	Armed deployment to reports of a male being forced into an address with a knife and sounds of an assault occurring within. Contain and call outs to the subject in the address and arrest.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested.
Body Worn Video	Yes.
Panel Observations	PM explained that the officers had been trying to negotiate with the DP to come to the door for 40 minutes prior to presenting the BWV which captured the use of force. An IM commented that in their opinion the incident went okay. The IM noted that they did not hear the officer state that they had withdrawn their taser on the BWV. PM explained that with firearms deployments the taser is used as a less lethal option in comparison to a conventional weapon. The taser is always used as a less lethal option in firearms deployment. This ensures that all levels are covered based on the threat level. An IM commented that they felt it was



	proportionate based on the report made to the police and the location of the incident. The IM commented that they felt it was good that it wasn't just a firearm but the option of the taser being there. PM explained that location and environment have to be considered when there is a firearms incident. Officers are overtly armed with a conventional weapon, a taser and a baton gun which provides officers with multiple options to handle the incident. An IM asked if something was taken out of the DP's hand, because they had not been able to identify what this was when viewing the BWV as it happened so quickly. PM confirmed that the officer taken the mobile phone out of the DPs hand on arrest. An IM asked whether the officers should have asked the DP to put the phone down. PM explained that the officers could have; but that the decision made by officers was likely to be to preserve evidence by intercepting his phone by immediate effect. PM highlighted that when the DP was being detained, he could be heard and seen on the BWV to be trying to make a call. An IM asked why the officers did not clear the area if they knew the only way out for the DP was through the front door. PM explained that he couldn't comment on this, and acknowledged the feedback. An IM commented that they didn't hear the officer announce, 'officer with a taser'.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that the officers had the legal basis. BWV gave evidence of compliance. Feedback to the officer about not stating they were an 'officer with a taser', when withdrawing and aiming their taser.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be given to the officer and their supervisor.



Case 3:

Date	24/20/2026
Time	20:00
Location	Derby
Subject	Male Black 18 – 30 years old
Type of force used	Taser – drawn; handcuffing to the front
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Moderator effects - Alcohol
Incident summary	Attended the address whereby a male has caused criminal damage in the address, parents and siblings fear of violence. Single crewed officer and the male ran off from police dropping stuff out of his pockets when running, running in a live road, failing to comply to orders to stop, when I grabbed the male he kept walking away and I believe he was trying to escape again. Drawn my taser for safety to prevent potential assault, prevent disappearance and to affect arrest, taser was in compressed ready position, this tactic helped gain compliance and affect arrest and prevent him from leaving the address again which caused fear. Males capabilities and intention were unknown, and he was unpredictable when getting hold of the male. Parents have mentioned he has been drinking alcohol recently, unsure whether he was under the influence.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested.
Body Worn Video	Yes.
Panel Observations	An IM stated that it was their opinion that the officer did well, and gave the DP three warnings. The IM stated that they felt the taser being withdrawn stopped the DP fleeing.



	An IM asked what the legal basis for the use of taser, and question whether this was to prevent a crime being committed because it was their opinion from viewing the BWV that the DP was not a risk to the officer, themselves or those around. PM explained that a taser is not to be used as an electric 'lasso' and that if the officer had discharged the taser when the DP was running, this may have been questionable as a use of force. Police Constable LB states that officers are taught not to use the force to prevent a DP fleeing. Police Constable LB highlighted impact factors of the DP being under the influence, and the DP was running through a live road. Police Constable LB highlighted that the officer had the duty of care for the DP for his safety. Police Constable LB highlighted that withdrawing a taser from the holder is classed as a use of force, even if the taser was not fired. PM explained that there is an expression used in training 'never, say never'. And this is because there are often many factors in play, which can impact the outcome and risk of an incident. PM explained an example of an officer applying the 'never, say never' expression where officers make decisions in a split second based on their training and risk assessment. An IM asked what drive stun means, PM explained that this is when the taser is applied directly to the subject's skin with the aim of causing pain. PM explained this is a controversial tactic because it can go against Human Rights. An IM commented that the tactic helped gain compliance and effect the arrest and the IM felt that it was a good job conducted by the officer. An IM commented that they felt it was a
--	--



	good job carried out by the officer. The IM commented that they were not convinced that the legal basis was there. The use of force in their opinion assisted a lawful arrest but felt that there wasn't any risk to the officer or the DP. PM reiterated that the lawful basis was in this case related to the duty of care to ensure the DP did not harm himself running into a live road.
Panel Decision	Mixed consensus from the panel with the majority of members agreeing that there was a legal basis for the use of force, but one member who did not believe there was a legal basis. BWV gave evidence of compliance.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be provided to the officer and their supervisor. Incident to be raised with use of force lead based on feedback.

Case 4:

Date	14/09/2025
Time	16:50
Location	Derbyshire
Subject	Male Black 18 – 30 years
Type of force used	Taser drawn, red dot
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Moderator effects - Drugs
Incident summary	Roads Policing Unit (RPU) officer stops uninsured vehicle on motorway. Driver attempted to produce fraudulent policy. When told vehicle being seized driver refused to hand over key and attempted to drive off which could have dragged the officer along hard shoulder. Officer managed to stall car and knock it out of gear whilst fighting with suspect.



	Taser drawn and red dotted to face as suspect wearing thick puffer jacket. Control gained and suspect handcuffed and arrested.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested.
Body Worn Video	Yes.
Panel Observations	PM was initially unable to provide the BWV clip for the panel to review. PM asked the group if they felt based on the summary provided if it was appropriate for the officer to use the taser when the vehicle is moving. An IM commented based on the explanation provided that the use of taser as red dotting was very appropriate, because of the risk to life for the officer, but also other road users on the motorway. An IM commented that the DP wanting to get away on the motorway would have been a risk to other drivers. And therefore, the use of taser was appropriate. PM highlighted that with the officer being half inside and half outside the vehicle, whilst the vehicle was moving was a risk to the officer's life. An IM asked if the BWV clip had been assigned to the wrong incident. PM explained that a new system has been introduced to store BWV and that the issue with the clip is due to the BWV clip PM had saved ahead of the meeting was further on in the incident when the DP had been arrested and detained in the back of the policing vehicle. An IM asked if the taser can be deployed to the face. PM explained that if this was a life or death situation where the officer was being dragged by a moving vehicle, this would be an appropriate use of force



	because it could be considered lethal use of force. PM explained that this is not where officers are routinely trained to aim the taser but under the circumstance, this is an accepted use of force. The IM noted incidents where subjects have worn thick puffer jackets to prevent the impact of the taser. PM explained that the new weapon taser 10 has been designed to penetrate thick clothing. PM located the correct BWV footage and presented this to the panel for comments and feedback. An IM questioned whether the officer got his taser out of the holster. An IM commented that the BWV did not completely match up to the summary provided on the use of force record. PM explained that the officer briefly withdrew the taser for a short amount of time and aimed this at the DP's face. Moreover, the DP complied and provided the keys to the vehicle. PM agreed that the BWV did not quite align to the summary of the use of force. The IM highlighted that it wasn't clear from the BWV whether the vehicle was moving. An IM asked about the drugs mentioned as a moderator effect. PM explained that the officer was going to drugs wipe the driver because the officer suspected the driver to be using cannabis. PM explained he was not able to confirm the outcome of the drugs wipe. An IM commented that the cases the panel viewed today, in their opinion were overall pleasing to see in terms of the officers response to the incidents, and the level of force used.
--	---



Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that there was a clear legal basis for the use of force. BWV gave evidence of compliance. Feedback to the officer about the difference between the use of force captured on the BWV and the summary provided on the use of force record.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be shared with the officer and their supervisor.

Case 5:

Date	31/20/2025
Time	01:10
Location	Derbyshire
Subject	Male Black 18 – 30 years
Type of force used	Taser – red dot
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Moderator effects - Alcohol, Psychological Weapons - Knife
Incident summary	Male attacking pub with weapons.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested.
Body Worn Video	Yes.
Panel Observations	An IM commented that from viewing the BWV that they were happy with the use of force. An IM commented that, following reviewing the BWV, that they were surprised that the officer did not shoot the DP.



	PM highlighted the large knife seen on the BWV to be withdrawn from the DP's trousers. The IM commented that in their opinion the officer was very patient with the DP. The IM commented it was their opinion that the use of force was necessary in that situation. PM commented on the officers moving the bystanders away from the incident, and that the officer was initially by himself dealing with the incident before back up arrived. PM explained often bystanders are a hindrance to situations. An IM commented that the officer was quite reserved, particularly with the DP continuing to use his phone and showing off. An IM commented that the officer was very calm and the officer didn't need to shout. The IM commented that in their opinion they felt the subject thought there was a power play going on between himself and the officer. An IM asked if the DP is known to the police. PM explained that he was unable to confirm this information.
Panel Decision	Consensus that the use of force had a legal basis and that the BWV gave evidence of compliance. Feedback from the panel on the patience of the officer when dealing with the DP.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be provided to the officer and their line manager.

Further Actions

No further actions.

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 9th September 2026, 10am - 12pm, MS Teams.

