



Independent
Advisory
Group

Derbyshire Constabulary
Independent Advisory Group
Use of Force Scrutiny Meeting
Wednesday 20th May 2026

Attendance Police

Police Sergeant Patrick Haley – Police Presenter (PH)

Police Constable Chad Critchley – Operations Training Team Leader (CC)

Inspector Nick Booth – Use of force Lead (NB)

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

Independent members

DD - Independent member

AT - Independent member

KH - Independent member

Apologies

LN - Independent member

CB - Independent member

JA - Independent member

CJ-B - Independent member

PD - Independent member

SH - Independent member

CH - Independent member

TC - Independent member

Welcome and Introductions

This meeting of the panel was held online via MS Teams. In the absence of a chair and vice chair HC reminded Independent Advisory Group (IAG) members that they had signed a confidentiality agreement. HC invited all present at the meeting to introduce themselves. Police Sergeant PH presented the cases and Body Worn Video (BWV), and Police Constable



CC the force's operational training team leader provided insights and explanations around trained tactics and procedures. The cases selected were thematic and involved subjects who identified as Black Heritage. This theme was requested from the Policing Powers Tactical Board.

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

BWV – Body Worn Video

CHB – Clear, Hold, Build - [Project Flex in Derby | Derbyshire Constabulary](#)

DP - Detained person

IAG – Independent Advisory Group

IM – Independent Members

PPST - Public and Personal Safety Training

PWITS – Possession with intent to supply

1) **Feedback from previous meeting**

Opportunity to discuss the previous meeting's feedback. This can include actions taken by the Police to address any areas of concern or praise that have previously raised.

Actions from previous meeting:

- Feedback to be shared with officers and supervisors (actioned).

2) **Use of Police Powers Scrutiny – Use of force – general**

Case 1:

Date	20/04/2026
Time	14:20
Location	Derby
Subject	Male Black Caribbean 21 years old
Type of force used	Handcuffing; non-compliant; unarmed skills order; Irritant Spray
Impact Factors (from Use of force form)	Drugs
Incident summary	Neighbourhood officers stop a male following intel of possession of drugs and an offensive weapon. Male tries to make off from officers but was taken to the floor and search was continued once back up arrived, male arrested following the find of a small amount of cannabis.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested



Body Worn Video (BWV)	Yes
Panel Observations	An Independent Member (IM) commented that from viewing the Body Worn Video (BWV) that the officer put the handcuffs on the DP without any introduction or explanation. Police Constable CC explained that the handcuffs may have been applied straight away due to the risk of safety based on the intelligence linking the DP to a weapon. An IM asked why the DP was not handcuffed to the rear. Police Constable CC explained that it is the officer's decision whether or not to handcuff to the front or rear and that the officer has to justify the technique used and the use of force. Police Constable CC commented that rear handcuffing is the safer choice. The IM stated that the intelligence did not state what type of weapon the DP was suspected of having in their possession, and queried whether the intelligence was real-time intelligence or historic. An IM highlighted that on the BWV that there was a struggle with the DP and that the officer was kicked in the head. The IM commented that in their opinion there was a safety concern from the onset, and that the force needs to promote the training and preference for rear handcuffing, so this is the response for all officers when there is a safety concern from the onset of an incident. Police Constable CC explained that the training team are delivering specific inputs to remind officers to conduct their risk assessments and that if there is a suspicion of a weapon, handcuffing to the rear should be the appropriate tactic. An IM commented that from viewing the BWV that they were happy with the use of force. The IM commented in their opinion the use of force initially did appear quite abrupt but did make sense based on the intelligence.

	An IM commented that it was their opinion from viewing the BWV that the officers responded quickly, and the officers provided an explanation of what they were doing. Police Constable CC explained that the officers prioritised the safety element for the officers and members of the public, before going through the stop search procedure. Inspector NB noted that the force has sent a reminder to officers earlier in the month in relation to issues around use of force, including that handcuffing to the front is not taught in Public and Personal Safety Training (PPST) and officers should handcuff to the rear. Inspector NB acknowledged that front handcuffing has been taught in PPST for years and the force still has officers handcuffing to the front.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that there was a legal basis for the use of force. Feedback to the officer on their good use of tactical communication and for providing a clear explanation. Feedback to officers about the use of rear handcuffing to maximise safety for all involved. BWV gave evidence of compliance.
Actions taken by Police / feedback provided	Feedback to be provided to the officer and their supervisor. Feedback to be taken to the next Policing Powers meeting.

Case 2:

Date	21/04/2026
Time	14:20
Location	Chesterfield
Subject	Male Not Stated 26 years old
Type of force used	Handcuffing: compliant
Impact Factors (from Use of force form)	Drugs, Prior knowledge, Size/Gender/Build
Incident summary	Intel received that the car and occupant involved in the supply of class A drugs around the Chesterfield area. Proactive officers stopped the vehicle, and driver was found to have a small amount of suspected cocaine on him as well as small amount of morphine in the car and he was arrested on suspicion of Possession With Intent To Supply (PWITS).
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested
Body Worn Video (BWV)	Yes
Panel Observations	An IM highlighted that the officer did not ask the DP whether they had anything on their possession when conducting the stop search. Police Constable CC explained it is not mandated that officers ask this as part of the stop search procedure, but it is advised and taught as a precautionary measure. An IM commented that from viewing the BWV they felt that there was no issue with the use of force and in their opinion the officer had clear decisive communication. An IM highlighted that on the BWV the officer handcuffed the DP to the front, and highlighted the officer could have handcuffed the DP to the rear. An IM asked if the officer could hold the handcuffs by the middle bar, because in a previous scrutiny panel meeting the PPST representative stated that officers should

	not do this. Police Constable CC explained that officers are taught to hold the DP by the bicep and not by the middle bar in the handcuff as this can cause pain to the DP if the handcuffs are moved or twisted by the officer's movement. An IM commented that they felt from viewing the BWV that the officers handled the incident well and had good communication. The IM commented that they felt walking the DP through the street to a policing vehicle was a questionable safety risk but noted that there were plenty of officer's present at the incident. Police Constable CC commented that the search level of the DP was good.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that the use of force had a legal basis. Feedback to the officer on the good use of tactical communication. Feedback to the officer on holding the handcuffs by the middle bar; reminding the officer that this is not the taught practice. BWV gave evidence of compliance.
Actions taken by Police / feedback provided	Feedback to be provided to the officer and their supervisor. Feedback to be taken to the next Policing Powers meeting.

Case 3:

Date	23/04/2026
Time	14:35
Location	Derby
Subject	Male Black Other/Other Black British/Other Caribbean Background 29 years old
Type of force used	Handcuffing: compliant
Impact Factors (from Use of force form)	Prior knowledge

Incident summary	Proactive stop by officer following intel on vehicle, driver and passenger of vehicle searched, passenger found with a few hundred pounds cash and a good quantity of class B drugs found in the vehicle. Driver and passenger arrested for PWITS.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Arrested
Body Worn Video (BWV)	Yes
Panel Observations	Sergeant Haley explained that the use of force the panel were reviewing involved the passenger in the BWV, prior to showing the panel the clip. An IM commented from viewing the BWV that they were worried about the vehicle speeding off and questioned at which point of the incident the vehicle keys were removed. Sergeant PH agreed that was a fair concern raised by the IM. Sergeant PH explained it was challenging to hear the conversation between the officer and the DP on the BWV due to the background noise and the church bells ringing. An IM felt in their opinion that this was the best case they had seen involving a use of force. The IM commented that the BWV in their opinion captured a really clear explanation provided by the officer explaining what was happening and why. An IM commented they thought they heard the officer asking the DP to take the keys out of the ignition on the BWV. An IM commented in their opinion that the officer was a bit long winded to begin with but was very clear in his explanation. The IM commented they liked how the officer handcuffed the DP initially to the front for safety but then moved the handcuffs to the rear as soon as they were detained on the pavement.

	An IM commented they had an issue with the sharing of contact numbers, particularly after the arrest of the DP. Police Constable CC commented that there was an issue with handcuffing the driver through the window. This could have been a safety risk for the officer had the driver driven off. Police Constable CC explained that for officer safety it would be good to clarify whether the officers did get the keys from the driver at the start of the incident.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that there was a legal basis for the use of policing powers. Good feedback for the officer in relation to their explanation to the DP. Feedback on the use of force through a vehicle window, as a potential safety risk if the keys had not been secured.
Actions taken by Police / feedback provided	Feedback to be provided to the officer and their supervisor. Feedback to be taken to the next Policing Powers meeting.

Case 4:

Date	27/04/2026
Time	14:25
Location	Derby
Subject	Male Black Other/Other Black British/Other Caribbean Background 18 years old
Type of force used	Handcuffing: compliant
Impact Factors (from Use of force form)	Drugs

Incident summary	Officer when on patrol spots a male smoking what appears to be cannabis and then is observed throwing it away. Officer approaches and cuffs the male and conducts a stop search and is then released.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Other
Body Worn Video (BWV)	Yes
Panel Observations	An IM commented from reviewing the BWV that the use of force in their opinion was fine and the DP was compliant. The IM stated that the search was not as good as what they thought it could have been. Police Constable CC agreed that the physical search felt a bit rushed. An IM commented that the search was rushed in their opinion and that the officer was polite and courteous. An IM commented that the officer was a little overfriendly and that the officer may have skipped what they should have done legislatively. The IM noted that the panel was focusing on use of force, and did not have any issues with the use of force used in this case. There was a comment from an IM on the use of language by the officer, referring to the DP as 'mate' throughout the interaction. An IM commented that they acknowledged that sometimes officers have to meet people where they are at for a calm outcome.
Panel Decision	Consensus from the panel that the use of force had a legal basis. IMs had mixed views on the interaction with the officer and the DP with a member commenting that they felt the officer was overfriendly.
Actions taken by Police / feedback provided	Feedback to be provided to the officer and their supervisor. Feedback to be taken to the next Policing Powers meeting.

Case 5:

Date	28/04/2026
Time	14:45
Location	Derby
Subject	Male Black Other/Other Black British/Other Caribbean Background 39 years old
Type of force used	Handcuffing: compliant
Impact Factors (from Use of force form)	Drugs
Incident summary	Neighbourhood officers see male come out of property known for drug taking and cuckooing, male was seen throwing away cannabis cigarette and was then cuffed and searched with negative result from body search.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Other
Body Worn Video (BWV)	Yes
Panel Observations	An IM commented that on the BWV that the officer could be seen holding the middle bar of the handcuffs. An IM commented that the demeanour of the DP as seen on the BWV raised a concern, because they appeared very unpredictable. An IM commented in terms of use of force that it was appropriate circumstances. The IM highlighted the concern relating to the handcuffing to the front and holding the middle bar of the handcuffs. Sergeant PH highlighted that on the BWV the officer could be seen adjusting the handcuffs. Police Constable CC highlighted that the

	handcuffs were hurting the DP and the DP verbalising this was because the officer was holding the middle bar of the handcuffs and the DP was moving their arms. An IM asked if the force uses internal pop ups on force devices or reminders about the handcuffing tactics. Police Constable CC explained that officers have refresher training every year. Police Constable CC highlighted that Inspector NB has put information out on the force intranet page to remind officers of the promoted handcuffing technique. Inspector NB explained that it is an officer decision on the use of force they use because they have to justify and explain this use of policing power. Moreover, the training team send out reminders for the preferred and taught tactic; and provide updates when there are changes nationally to approved practice. Inspector NB explained that there is an assumption that a DP may be more compliant with front handcuffing, and that it can be more challenging to manoeuvre someone into a policing vehicle. Inspector NB stated that this is not the case. Police Constable CC highlighted that in refresher training officers are only shown rear handcuffing. Police Constable CC highlighted on initial training officers are taught front and rear, but it is emphasised that the preference is rear handcuffing. Police Constable CC explained that compliance should not impact the decision making for the use of force in relation to handcuffing techniques.
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 in relation to handcuffing technique used and reminder not to hold the middle bar as this is not trained practice.
Actions taken by Police / feedback provided	Feedback to be provided to the officer and their supervisor. Feedback to be taken to the next Policing Powers meeting.

Case 6:

Date	29/04/2026
Time	16:50
Location	Derby
Subject	Male Mixed White and Black Caribbean 19 years old
Type of force used	Unarmed skills order
Impact Factors (from Use of force form)	Drugs
Incident summary	Neighbourhood officers catch a known male acting suspiciously and ruffling around the top of his trousers giving the suspicion he is hiding something. Stop and search is negative a strip search is then authorised again with a negative result. Subsequent checks reveal the male is wanted for criminal damage.
Outcome (i.e. arrested)	Other
Body Worn Video (BWV)	Yes
Panel Observations	Sergeant PH explained that the officers do not find anything on the DP, but the DP did have an outstanding warrant. An IM commented that from viewing the BWV it was their opinion that it was not easy for the officers with the DP and other individuals around at the incident being intrusive. An IM commented from viewing the BWV that there was a concern in relation to officer safety and the officers were trying to deal with the DP initially in a confined space, and there were other people going in and out of the residence. The IM commented that this could have implications on the integrity of an investigation. An IM commented that they were not keen on the distance between the officer calling the reactive inspector and the DP and other

	person's with just one officer. An IM acknowledged that the officer needed to relay the circumstances to the Inspector but felt that the officer left their colleague a bit exposed to potential harm. An IM noted from viewing the BWV that in their opinion the stop search procedure was rushed and disjointed but felt it was appropriate under the circumstances because of the DP's response and the interference from other people in the location. An IM asked if anything is done at swearing at the police. Sergeant PH explained that the bar is much higher for police; and the courts highlight that officers have to accept this to some degree as part of the profession. Police Constable CC highlighted that there was a point at where the officer nearly lost it but did bring it back. Police Constable CC highlighted that officers have to be careful about the language they use. Police Constable CC highlighted that the officer when he arrived to detain the individual, he did not have his handcuffs on his possession. Police Constable CC explained that officers are reminded to ensure they have their equipment on them prior to attending an incident, but acknowledged that the officer may have arrested someone prior to attending this incident. An IM asked what was the issue with taking the DP to a police station for the strip search. Sergeant PH explained that a strip search can take place in space that is private and not in view of the public. Sergeant PH explained that the DP had been captured on BWV agreeing to the search taking place in the private location just off the street instead of attending a police station. The IM noted that the officer did not search the DP's bag during the stop search. Sergeant
--	--

	PH explained that the officers searched the bag in the little room when the handcuffs were removed for the strip search. The IM noted that in their opinion there wasn't any concern in relation to racism from the officers. An IM noted that on the BWV they heard the DP mentioned that he had been stopped and searched earlier in the day; which is why the DP was stating the police were harassing him. Sergeant PH highlighted that there is an active Clear, Hold, Build (CHB) project currently in Derby City which includes proactively conducting stop searches in the city centre in Derby to disrupt issues relating to the supply of drugs and other anti-social behaviour.
Panel Decision	Consensus that there was a legal basis for the use of force. BWV gave evidence of compliance. Feedback to the officers on their good response based on the location and the number of individuals present. Safety concern to be raised for the initial detainment in a confined space, and the proximity to a busy road. Reminder to the officer to ensure they have their equipment prior to attending an incident.
Actions taken by Police / feedback provided	Feedback to be provided to the officer and their supervisor. Feedback to be taken to the next Policing Powers meeting.

Further actions:

Feedback to be presented at the upcoming Policing Powers meeting (May 2026).

Feedback to be shared with officers and their supervisors.

Date of next meeting:

Thursday 23rd July 2026, 6pm – 8pm, MS Teams.

