



Derbyshire Constabulary Independent Advisory Group

Use of Force Taser Scrutiny Meeting

Date: Wednesday 9th September 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)

Katie Gallacher – police staff observing (KG)

His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) representative observing (HS)

Independent members

DD - Independent member

BC - Independent member

FK - Independent member

KH - Independent member

PH - Independent member

Apologies

TC - Independent member

RG - Independent member

MY - Independent member

NJ - 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.

The force is currently undergoing a His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy (PEEL) inspection

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



and a representative from HMICFRS attended the meeting to observe. The representative explained this to the panel. More information about PEEL inspections can be found on the HMICFRS website: [What is PEEL? - His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services](#)

HC provided the link to the published use of force statistics for the force with the panel: [Use of force | Derbyshire Constabulary](#).

PM explained that he captured a summary from the chronicle forms that officers complete for use of force. PM presented the cases and the Body Worn Video (BWV). PM and Police Constable LB answered questions and provided explanations relating to the procedure and training for tasers.

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

1. From viewing the 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
EMD – Emotionally and mentally disturbed
GBH – Grievous Bodily Harm
IAG – Independent Advisory Group
IM – Independent Member
NDM – National Decision-Making model
RDH – Royal Derby Hospital
RPU – Roads Policing Unit
STO – Specially Trained Officer

Feedback from previous meeting

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

1) Use of Police Powers Scrutiny

Case 1:

Date	31/08/2026
Time	20:44
Location	Derby City
Subject	Male Asian 18 -30

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



Type of force used	Laser dot challenge; handcuffing - rear
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Psychological/EMD [emotionally and mentally disturbed]
Incident summary	Kidnap 3x males have taken IP [independent party] in a vehicle at knifepoint.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Detained for search
Body Worn Video	Yes
Panel Observations	After presenting the Body Worn Video (BWV) PM provided some context that the officers during the incident had determined that they were not dealing with the suspect but the victim. An IM commented that in their opinion, from viewing the BWV it was was a stressful situation for the officers. The IM commented that it may have been prudent for one of the officers to search the detained person (DP), whilst the second officer searched the vehicle. An IM commented that it was their opinion from viewing the BWV that the officers had responded to the incident extremely well. PM explained that the officers had to properly secure the DP; and once this had been done the second officer went to clear the vehicle with firearm present. PM explained that from viewing the BWV that the officers appeared fairly confident that there was no one else in the vehicle. An IM commented that they felt the officers had dealt with the incident well, and in their opinion, from viewing the BWV had put the DP at ease. An IM commented they did not hear the officer on BWV announce that they were a police officer with a taser. And the IM noted that they did not see the dot on the DP. PM explained that the male officer had the taser withdrawn with the green dot on the DP as the less lethal option. The initial

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



	contact was with a firearms cover by the second attending officer. PM explained that the officer was using one of the new Taser x10 devices which use a singular green dot for deployment. The Taser X2 devices use two red dots and are the previous model the force has used. An IM commented overall they felt that the incident was handled well by officers. An IM commented that there was a concern with what may have been happening in the vehicle when the officers were detaining and searching the DP. PM highlighted that the BWV can be very two dimensional and that the BWV doesn't capture everything the officer sees. PM stated he couldn't comment on their decision making but that firearms officers are highly trained around threat assessment and response. PM highlighted that there were two officers present, and that initially they had to deal with the priority, which was the DP in that moment. The next priority is clearing the car. PM explained that the female officer went to the vehicle and cleared it at gun point. An IM commented that they had a concern the officer could not have known what was going on in the vehicle; and felt that the officers had not prioritised the risk. An IM commented that the incident was complex, tense and was well handled in their opinion. An IM commented that it was a well-handled and noted in their opinion it appeared to be a highly stressed incident.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that the use of force had a legal basis. Panel felt that officers handled the incident well. Positive feedback from a member relating to officers' response to the DP as a victim and putting them at ease. Overall the panel felt the officers handled the incident well.

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



	Note: one member felt from viewing the footage the officers did not prioritise the risk and were too slow to search the vehicle.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be shared with officers and policing power leads.

Case 2:

Date	30/08/2026
Time	21:20
Location	Chesterfield
Subject	Male White (other) 31 - 64
Type of force used	Green dotted; handcuffing - rear
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Psychological/EMD [emotionally and mentally disturbed]; weapon - knife
Incident summary	Initial report of suspect following IP [independent party] around and had threatened IP with a knife making threats to kill, further call from another informant who saw a knife and suspect being aggressive smashing a window. Suspect located sat in a car, was in a dark car park with only alley light to assist, suspect green dotted due to possibility of a knife either on the suspect or in his car and being single crewed, male safely detained without further use of taser.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested
Body Worn Video	Yes
Panel Observations	From viewing the BWV an IM commented that they had a concern with the transition of the officer holding the taser, putting the taser in the holster and applying the handcuffs. The IM commented they had a second concern which was the female officer who attended the incident declined to explain the reason for the arrest when the DP asked.

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



	PM explained that the officer put their taser back in the holster and applied the handcuffs. The officer has to manage the risk and make a decision as to whether to put the taser in the holster and apply handcuffs or wait for another officer to arrive, keep the dot on the DP whilst the second officer applies handcuffs. PM acknowledged the feedback on the female officer declining to reexplain the reason for arrest, and noted that on the BWV the female officer could be heard explained to the DP that the reason would be explained again at custody. PM explained that language may have been a barrier. And as soon as the DP arrives at custody an interpreter can be accessed to assist with the communication. An IM commented from viewing the BWV that it was their opinion that it was a stressful situation. An IM noted from viewing the BWV that the officer did not state who he was, and that he was a police officer, and the DP appeared confused in the BWV. The IM did acknowledge from the BWV that it was clear the officer was a police officer having exited a marked police vehicle in full police uniform. PM noted it was captured on the BWV clip audio that the officer did identify himself. An IM commented that they felt the officer put themselves at risk and that the DP could have heard the taser click when it went back into the holster and could have responded to this by becoming uncompliant. The IM asked whether it was standard training to take down the DP and to ask the DP to go to the floor. Because if this was standard training, why had the officer not done this? Police Constable LB explained that it is a challenging incident and noted that the officer tested compliance and that the DP was compliant and following instructions. Police Constable LB explained that taser officers are trained to gain thumb control if
--	--

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



	they are putting away the taser to apply handcuffs, as this technique assists the officer in gaining control of a DP. Police Constable LB explained that taser trained officers are not firearms officers, and the officer was single crewed. Police Constable LB noted that the taser was not used as a tool of compliance. Police Constable LB explained the response will differ depending on the officer, the incident and what the risk is. PM explained that if a DP demonstrates any form of resistance the officer can change their response and their tactics. PM noted that the DP was compliant in the BWV clip, and that the officer had asked the DP to face the vehicle with his hands behind his back. PM explained had the DP become non-compliant the officer could have changed his response, including withdrawing the taser if required. An IM commented that useful analysis of the case shows that the incident was carried out appropriately for circumstances. An IM commented that they felt from viewing the BWV that the incident was sympathetically well handled. An IM questioned whether the female officer would have been aware of the reason for the arrest. PM explained he could not answer, but noted the BWV captured the female officer arriving to the incident after the initial arrest and the female officer explained to the DP that the reason for the arrest would be explained again at custody.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that the use of force had a legal basis. IMs felt that the officer handled the incident well. An IM commented that they felt the officer should have initially identified himself as a police officer to the DP, but acknowledged that the officer was in uniform and arrived in a marked policing vehicle.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be shared with officers and policing power leads.

Case 3:

Date	19/08/2026
Time	20:00
Location	Shirebrook
Subject	Male White 18 - 30
Type of force used	Alcohol/ Psychological/EMD [emotionally and mentally disturbed]
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Taser discharged; handcuffs - rear
Incident summary	Reports of a male smashing up property and had strangled neighbour. Officers arrive and male has barricaded himself in room whilst making threats to stab and burn officers should they force entry. Subject then makes intentions known of suicide before attempting to tie a rope in order to kill himself. Taser discharged to stop him. Male arrested and secured in cuffs.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested
Body Worn Video	Yes
Panel Observations	An IM asked for PM to clarify is the DP was on the ledge when the officer had deployed the taser resulting in the DP falling back into the room in the property. The IM questioned how the officer would know which way the DP would fall. PM noted that the DP could have fallen back on to the flat roof. As a taser firer the officer is unable to control where the DP will fall. PM stated from reading the officers account the officer has seen the DP trying to put a rope around his neck, and the officer responded to stop the DP doing this. PM explained that with the new taser the distance for a shot has increased from 25 feet to 40 feet. This meant that the officer was apply to effectively deploy the taser from a further distance.

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



	An IM noted from viewing the BWV it was their opinion that the officer had dealt with a difficult and emotional situation, and the IM noted no concern with the officers response in use of force. An IM wanted to pass on his thanks for a job well done. The IM stated from watching the BWV that they felt that the officer handled this incident very compassionately. An IM commented that they felt the officer handled the incident well, and there was a good reason for the use of taser. An IM commented from viewing the BWV that the incident was fast moving and well handled by officers.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that there was a clear legal basis for the use of force. Panel members were particularly impressed with the compassionate response from the officer and felt that the incident was well handled. An IM wanted assurance that thanks from the group would be passed on to the officer because he handled a challenging and emotive incident really well.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be shared with officers and policing power leads. Highlight case to policing power leads for thanks to be passed on to officer.

Case 4:

Date	16/08/2026
Time	14:30
Location	Derby City
Subject	Male White 31 - 64
Type of force used	Taser discharged, handcuffs - rear
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Alcohol, Psychological
Incident summary	Male pointing gun at members of public. Taser discharged.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested
Body Worn Video	Yes
Panel Observations	An IM commented from viewing the BWV it was their opinion that the officers were a bit slow in sitting the DP up considering the amount of blood on the road from the head injury. An IM commented that from viewing the BWV they had no concern with the use of taser by the officer in this incident. PM explained that the DP had dropped a BB gun at the start of the BWV, and the officer had used a taser to prevent the DP from getting to a firearms officer. PM noted that the DP had a superficial cut which was sustained during the detainment of the DP. An IM commented from viewing the BWV that the incident happened quickly. The IM commented that the armed officer had approved the DP to detain them, the DP's head hit the floor and questioned if this was excessive force because the DP had been subdued with the taser. PM explained that the BWV shows the

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



	officer manipulating the DP into a position where the officer could apply handcuffs to the rear. PM noted that the impact factors recorded indicate that the DP was under the influence of alcohol and that the DP is likely to have not had full control of his head. PM explained that he cannot comment on whether an officer perceived the DP to be a threat when applying handcuffs, because the officer is the only person who can identify his perception of threat and justify his use of force. PM explained that the BWV captures the DP being asked by officers to follow instructions, and the BWV captures the DP not being compliant, and continuing towards a firearms officer. PM noted that the initial report to police included information that the DP was in possession of a firearm. An IM commented that from viewing the BWV it was their opinion that the use of a taser was effective and the IM had no issues. PM explained the detainment procedure if a DP has been tasered is that the DP should be handcuffed as quickly as possible. Armed officers are trained to apply handcuffs when the DP has been tasered, this is to ensure that there is no further threat and enables officers to secure the DP to conduct a search. The question of excessive force is reviewed by the Professional Standards Department in the event of a complaint. Prisoner handling training is taught through the officer safety training. An IM commented that from viewing the BWV that they had no issue with the response of the officers and the use of the taser. An IM asked what was the perception of the public viewing the incident. PM explained that he couldn't comment on this because he did not know. PM noted he was not aware of any complaints from the public. PM explained that the officers had moved members of the public away from the area because of the firearms present, and that there was an ongoing incident for the safety
--	--

	of everyone present, including the wider members of the public. PM noted that the BWV showed the officer being forceful in keeping members of the public away. An IM asked if there was a chance the weapon would have gone off when on the floor with the DP. PM explained the different weapons and officer carries, and how these are secured safely to ensure that there is not a risk of a weapon going off accidentally. IM asked about the data on accidental discharge of a weapon. PM noted he did not have access to this data. An IM commented that the use of the taser was justified in their opinion, and that unfortunately the DP was injured as part of the detainment. An IM commented that they felt the taser use was appropriate. An IM commented that they felt the use of force by the officer during the detainment of the DP was not excessive.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that the use of force had a legal basis. Majority of the panel felt that the officer responded appropriately and the use of taser was effective. One member questioned the force used when detaining the DP.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be shared with officers and policing power leads. Highlight case to policing power leads for thanks to be passed on to officer.

Case 5:

Date	09/07/2026
Time	21:20
Location	Ilkeston
Subject	Male White 31 - 64

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



Type of force used	Taser discharged
Impact Factors (from Use of Force form)	Alcohol
Incident summary	Subject involved in suspect GBH [grievous bodily harm] armed with weapon and made off from the scene through the garden, subject has warning markers for Resisting arrest and escaper, due to concerns surrounding a weapon, STO [specially trained officer] has self authorised and attended, and pursued the suspect on foot, Verbal challenges were given to the suspect to no avail; subject has tried to close officer down putting officer into fear of violence and Has been tasered, NMI [neuromuscular incapacitation] initially effective but Failed upon impacting ground with barb no longer in skin, subject has then tried to be detained on the ground but has assaulted Officer, STO [specially trained officer] has then stepped back and fired 2 further shots to acheive NMI [neuromuscular incapacitation] and safely detain the suspect without further violence. Subject arrested for numerous offences and transfered to RDH [Royal Derby Hospital] due to comments of swallowing drugs during pursuit. No adverse effects of taser registered at the initial point to the subject.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested
Body Worn Video	Yes
Panel Observations	PM explained that following the application of handcuffs that the officers assist the DP in a seated position and carry out after care. An IM asked what the continual buzzing on the second taser deployment, that they heard on the BWV. PM explained that the officer fired the taser again and extended the cycle. The buzzing and beeping are an indication that the weapon is being extended.

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire



	An IM asked why the DP was not handcuffed to the rear. PM explained that when the cycle was extended an officer has to justify the length of time that the taser is used. Therefore, the priority is to secure the DP as soon as possible. The DP's hands were in front of him, so the second officer applied the handcuffs to the front so that the cycle of taser energy could be released. PM explained that once the DP is secure and moving into a seated position, the officers would then change the handcuffs to the rear. Police Constable LB noted the strong tactical communication from the officer directing the officer to apply the handcuffs because the officer had to justify the extension of the use of taser. Police Constable LB explained that by applying the handcuffs to the front, the officer also mitigated the risk of becoming part of the taser circuit. Had the second officer put their hands between the taser probes or touched the taser they would have been zapped by the taser. An IM asked what the role of the second officer was with the baton. The IM noted that from viewing the BWV they perceived the second officer to be pushing the DP towards the taser officer by using their baton. PM noted on the BWV the DP could be seen as presenting a threat, and the officer had been providing instructions that the DP was not following, and the officer had tried to give the DP a chance to surrender, he did not which resulted in the officer deciding to deploy the taser. Each individual officer uses the National Decision Making (NDM) model to determine their perceived threat, and they make a decision as to what their response will be. As the second officer was not a taser trained officer, PM explained that the officer will have made a decision to use a baton based on their decision making using
--	---

	the NDM. An IM commented that the second taser was well executed. An IM commented that from viewing the BWV that they felt the use of taser was appropriate as the DP was continuing to be threatening even after the officer gave the DP instructions to stop. An IM commented that they felt the actions of the police were appropriate because the role of the police is to protect the public. The IM noted that police officers are human, and that the officer are dealing with unknown circumstances. An IM commented that they feel that the officers are doing a great job particularly with all the negativity and scrutiny around police officer response and justifying their actions.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that the use of force had a legal basis. Overall the panel felt that the officer responded appropriately and the use of taser was effective.
Actions taken by Police/ feedback	Feedback to be shared with officers and policing power leads. Highlight case to policing power leads for thanks to be passed on to officer.

Further Actions

PM to share feedback from the panel with officers and their supervisors.

HC to share feedback from panel with use of force leads (actioned 11/09/2026).

Date of next meeting

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

OUR PRIORITIES Prevent · Respond · Safeguard · Investigate

One Derbyshire

