

## COMMISSIONERS INDEPENDENT SCRUTINY REPORT

### Custody & Detention – Mental Health Process

### 29 June 2022

<b>Scrutiny Panel:</b>	<b>Custody &amp; Detention</b>
<b>Members:</b>	<p>Jim Rowley – Chair George Beech MBE Carol Bullock Samantha Couzens Sophia Norrington Joshua Whitehurst</p>
<b>Purpose:</b>	<p>That the correct procedure has been followed with regard to the detention of detainees with mental health issues. To ensure that the process is compliant with the law and best practice.</p> <p>For all aspects, the scrutiny should demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the action/behaviour justified</li> <li>- Has it been explained adequately</li> <li>- Has it been recorded properly</li> </ul>
<b>Panel Findings:</b>	<p>The panel selected 4 incidents initially. Two incidents were found not to be mental health related detentions and were disregarded.</p> <p>Two detentions were scrutinised fully. These were Custody Record C22004313 and Custody Record C22005041.</p> <p>CCTV footage of the booking in process was provided and redacted copies of the Custody log were also provided.</p> <p><b>Custody Record C22004313</b></p> <p>Panel members noted that the sound quality of the CCTV was very poor and this meant it was difficult to hear what was being said and the responses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A thorough and robust explanation of the custody log was given by Inspector Graham.</li> <li>2. The panel noted that the custody facility seemed well run and custody logs were detailed.</li> <li>3. Panel members were particularly impressed with the caring and professional conduct of officers when dealing with this unwell detainee. In</li> </ol>



particular Officer 25655 Singende who demonstrated calming and supportive actions to the detainee.

4. The panel were confident and happy that all processes had been complied with for this detention

#### **Custody Record C22005041**

1. Panel members noted that the sound quality of the CCTV was very poor again and this meant it was difficult to hear what was being said and the responses.
2. A thorough and robust explanation of the custody log was given by Inspector Graham.
3. The panel noted that the custody facility seemed well run and custody logs were detailed.
4. The panel noted that the custody log was very detailed and demonstrated the level of care that was shown and reviewed at regular periods.
5. The panel were confident and happy that all processes had been complied with for this detention

The panel thanked Chief Inspector Barrow and Inspector Graham for their comprehensive explanations of a difficult process.

#### **Recommendations:**

The panel recommend the following:

1. There should be a better way of recording on NICHE where a Mental Health Act Assessment has been requested which will enable a swift method of identifying these types of cases for future review. The Force indicated that there is no specific field and cases are identified by 'Text Search' which isn't always accurate.
2. Sound quality on CCTV footage to be improved. Concern was raised that the poor quality would hamper any future investigations of incidents in custody and future scrutiny reviews.
3. The panel would review various stages of the booking in process rather than view the whole process on CCTV.



**Force Lead Response:**

Observation noted and agree that the CCTV was poor.

I welcome the positive feedback around the officer PC Singende (email sent to officer).

An email has been sent to Custody officers requesting that the pre-defined detention logs around MHA are used which will assist in researching the MHA custody records in the future.