



College of
Policing

Digest

April 2014

A digest of police law, operational policing practice and criminal justice

The Digest is a primarily legal environmental scanning publication intended to capture and consolidate topical and key issues, both current and future, impacting on all areas of policing.

During the production of the Digest, information is included from governmental bodies, criminal justice organisations and research bodies. As such, the Digest should prove an invaluable guide to those responsible for strategic decision making, operational planning and police training.

The College of Policing aims to provide fair access to learning and development for all. To support this commitment, the Digest is available in alternative formats on request. Please email digest@college.pnn.police.uk or telephone +44 (0)1480 334568.

Disclaimer and copyright details

This document is intended as a guide to inform organisations and individuals of current and forthcoming issues in the policing environment and the College of Policing cannot guarantee its suitability for any other purpose.

While every effort has been made to ensure that the information is accurate, the College of Policing cannot accept responsibility for the complete accuracy of the material. As such, organisations and individuals should not base strategic and operational decisions solely on the basis of the information supplied.

© - College of Policing Limited (2014)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, modified, amended, stored in any retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior written permission of the College or its representative.

The above restrictions do not apply to police forces, which are authorised to use this material for official, non-profit-making purposes only.

Copyright enquiries: +44 (0)1256 602650

Digest editor: +44 (0)1480 334568

Contents

Overview	5
Legislation	6
Bills before parliament	6
Criminal Justice and Courts Bill	6
Statutory Instruments	8
The Criminal Procedure (Amendment No. 2) Rules 2013	8
The Parole Board (Amendment) Rules 2014	9
The Road Traffic Offenders (Additional Offences) Order 2014	9
The Fixed Penalty (Amendment) Order 2014	9
The Road Safety (Financial Penalty Deposit) (Amendment) Order 2014	10
The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment) Regulations 2014	10
The Police Pensions (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 2014	11
The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012	11
(Commencement No. 9, Saving Provision and Specification of Commencement Date) Order 2014	
The Police Act 1996 (Equipment) (Amendment) Regulations 2014	12
Crime and Security Act 2010 (Commencement No. 7) Order 2014	12
The Criminal Justice Act 2003 (Commencement No. 32) Order 2014	12
Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (Commencement No. 1) Order 2014	13
Criminal Justice (Electronic Monitoring) (Responsible Person) (No 2) Order 2014	13
New legislation	14
Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014	14
Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014	15
Case law	17
Evidence and procedure	17
Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis v Dawn Bangs [2014] EWHC 546 (Admin)	17
General police duties	24
DSD and another v The Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis [2014] EWHC 436 (QB)	24

Policing practice	27
Crime	27
Draft Guidance on Police Post-incident Management	27
Final Report Published: Review of IPCC’s Work in Investigating Deaths	28
Police	29
Ellison Independent Review Report Published	29
Independent Review of the Police Federation	30
Home Office Circular 003/2014: increased police officer pension	31
contributions 2014 to 2015	
Criminal justice system	32
Domestic Violence Action Plan 2014	32
Clare’s Law Implementation	33

Overview

This month's edition of the Digest contains a summary of issues relating to police law, operational policing practice and criminal justice.

There are reports of cases on:

- the procedure on an application for disclosure of an Information in support of a search warrant under the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 where disclosure was refused by the Police Service on the grounds of public interest immunity
- claims under the Human Rights Act 1998 for alleged failures on the part of the Metropolitan Police Service to conduct an effective investigation into allegations by victims of serious sexual assault.

We look in detail at the:

- final IPCC report of its review into the procedure for investigating deaths
- report of the Independent Review of the Police Federation
- Home Office report of the Ellison Independent Review.

We also look at the:

- Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014
- IPCC consultation on police post-incident management
- Revised Domestic Violence action plan 2014
- Domestic Violence Disclosure scheme
- Home Office Circular on amendments to Police Pensions Regulations.

The progress of proposed new legislation through parliament is examined and relevant Statutory Instruments are summarised.

Legislation

Bills before parliament

On **8 May 2013**, the Queen's Speech unveiled the legislative programme for the 2013-2014 parliamentary session. The progress of Bills can be found at <http://services.parliament.uk/bills/>

Criminal Justice and Courts Bill

This Government Bill was presented to Parliament on **5 February 2014**. The Bill had its second reading debate in the House of Commons on **24 February 2014** and considered in a Public bill Committee on **25 March 2014**. The Public Bill Committee is expected to report by **1 April 2014**.

The Bill is to make provision about how offenders are dealt with before and after conviction; to amend the offence of possession of extreme pornographic images; to make provision about the proceedings and powers of courts and tribunals; to make provision about judicial review; and for connected purposes. In particular the Bill provides for:

- sentencing, release and recall of offenders, the electronic monitoring of offenders released on licence, and the giving of cautions
- adding certain offences, including those of weapons training for terrorist purposes and causing gunpowder or other explosive substances to explode with intent, to the enhanced dangerous offenders sentencing scheme
- the offence in 63 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 to be extended to cover the possession of extreme images that depict rape and non-consensual sexual penetration
- the detention of young offenders, giving cautions and conditional cautions to youths and referral orders
- a new criminal offence of being unlawfully at large after recall from licence or after recall from home detention curfew
- restrictions on the use of simple cautions for indictable only offences and certain specified either way offences, as well as restricting the repeated use of cautions for persistent offenders

- a new procedure for use in criminal proceedings in the magistrates' courts in certain circumstances, provision about the recovery of the costs of the criminal courts from offenders, about appeals and costs in civil proceedings and about contempt of court and juries
- the introduction of 4 offences (research by jurors, sharing research with other jurors, jurors engaging in other prohibited conduct and disclosing jury's deliberations), a power for a court to order temporary removal of electronic communications devices from jurors and changes to strict liability contempt by publication including a notice procedure for temporary removal of potentially contemptuous information from public access
- the circumstances in which the High Court and the Upper Tribunal may refuse relief in judicial review proceedings and funding and costs in relation to such proceedings.

Statutory Instruments

SI 2013/3183 The Criminal Procedure (Amendment No. 2) Rules 2013

Rule 7 of these Rules came into force on **24 February 2014** and rules 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 will come into force on **7 April 2014**.

These Rules make the following amendments to the Criminal Procedure Rules 2013, SI 2013/1554:

Part 2 Rule 2.2 is amended to substitute the new title of the Lord Chief Justice's Practice Directions.

Part 5 Rule 5.8 is amended to require the publication of specified details of cases due to be heard.

Part 9 Rule 9.2 is amended to supply the procedure the court must follow where either section 51(7) or section 51A(6) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 applies (defendants jointly charged with an offence that can be tried either in the Crown Court or in a magistrates' court and who are dealt with on the same occasion). Rule 9.7 is amended in consequence.

Part 12 New rules are inserted to supply the procedure in proceedings under Schedule 17 to the Crime and Courts Act 2013, which provides for deferred prosecution agreements.

Part 76 Rule 76.7 and the note to that rule are amended to provide for costs orders to be made in connection with deferred prosecution agreements, and rule 76.1 and the note to that rule are amended in consequence.

The notes to rules 62.5 and 62.9 are amended to include references to the names by which the types of contempt of court with which each rule deals are sometimes described elsewhere.

The note to rule 76.4 is amended to take account of the Costs in Criminal Cases (General) (Amendment) (No 2) Regulations 2013, SI 2013/2830.

The new part 12 came into force on **24 February 2014** and the other changes made by these Rules come into force on **7 April 2014**.

SI 2014/240 The Parole Board (Amendment) Rules 2014

The rules came into force on **1 April 2014**.

These rules amend the Parole Board Rules 2011 to remove the requirement for oral panels hearing the cases of prisoners serving a life sentence or a sentence during Her Majesty's pleasure to include a sitting or retired judge and to have a sitting or retired judge acting as chair of the oral panel.

SI 2014/260 The Road Traffic Offenders (Additional Offences) Order 2014

This Order came into force on **1 April 2014**.

The Order amends section 20 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, which allows records from prescribed devices, such as Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras, to be used as evidence in proceedings for certain offences. This Order adds the offence of using or keeping a heavy goods vehicle on a public road in the UK without paying the levy to the offences for which evidence from prescribed devices is admissible in Great Britain.

SI 2014/259 The Fixed Penalty (Amendment) Order 2014

This Order came into force on **1 April 2014**. It applies in relation to a fixed penalty offence alleged to have been committed on or after 1 April 2014.

This Order amends the Fixed Penalty Order 2000 by adding a monetary amount for the fixed penalty prescribed for the offence under section 11 of the HGV Road User Levy Act 2013 (the 2013 Act).

The 2013 Act introduces a levy for using or keeping a heavy goods vehicle (HGV) weighing 12 tonnes or more on a public road in the UK. Section 11 of the 2013 Act makes it an offence to use or keep such a vehicle on a road in the UK without paying the appropriate levy. In order to enable cost-effective and proportionate enforcement of the levy, section 13 of the 2013 Act adds the offence in section 11 to the lists of offences in Schedule 3 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 for which fixed penalties may be issued by enforcement authorities in Great Britain. The monetary amount of each fixed penalty is set out in the Fixed Penalty Order 2000 (the 2000 Order).

Article 2 of this Order amends the Table in Schedule 1 to the 2000 Order to add the monetary amount for the fixed penalty offence under section 11 of the 2013 Act.

SI 2014/267 The Road Safety (Financial Penalty Deposit) (Amendment) Order 2014

This Order came into force on **1 April 2014**.

This Order amends the Road Safety (Financial Penalty Deposit) Order 2009 by adding to the list of offences for which a financial penalty deposit may be required the offence of using or keeping a heavy goods vehicle (HGV) on a public road without paying the HGV road user levy under section 11(1) of the HGV Road User Levy Act 2013 (the 2013 Act).

The 2013 Act introduces a levy for using or keeping an HGV weighing 12 tonnes or more on a public road in the UK. Section 11 of the 2013 Act makes it an offence to use or keep such a vehicle on a road in the UK without paying the appropriate levy. In order to enable cost-effective and proportionate enforcement of the levy, section 13 of the 2013 Act adds the offence in section 11 to the list of offences in Schedule 3 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 (the 1988 Act) for which fixed penalty notices may be issued by enforcement authorities in Great Britain. The monetary amount of each fixed penalty is set out in the Fixed Penalty Order 2000. Part IIIA of the 1988 Act enables enforcement authorities in Great Britain to require financial penalty deposits from any person issued with a fixed penalty notice if that person does not have a satisfactory UK address. The list of offences for which financial penalty deposits may be required is set out in the 2009 Order.

Article 2 of this Order adds a new Table in Part 1 of the Schedule to the 2009 Order to add the offence in section 11(1) of the 2013 Act to the list offences for which a financial penalty deposit may be required by enforcement authorities in Great Britain.

SI 2014/264 The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment) Regulations 2014

These Regulations came into force on **1 April 2014**.

These Regulations amend regulation 80 of the Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 in order to comply with restrictions placed on the level of Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) on heavy goods vehicles by Directive 1999/62/EC (OJ L187, 20.7.1997, p. 42). The Directive sets minimum amounts of VED for vehicles according to their weight in bands, but a historical difference in the way that the band limits for VED are set in the Directive and in the UK has created a difficulty for vehicles falling on a band limit. The band limits in Annex I of the Directive start at 'not less than' a specified weight and end at 'less than' a greater specified weight, as opposed to band limits in the UK, which start at 'not over' a specified weight and end at 'not over' a greater specified weight.

As a result of the way bands are set in the UK, vehicles tend to be plated voluntarily at the top of their respective bands. For example, a three-axle vehicle plated at exactly 21,000kg will fall into VED B* in the UK costing £200 per year. Under the Directive the same vehicle will fall within the band spanning not less than 21,000kg to less than 23,000kg, which sets a minimum VED rate of €222.

The HGV Road User Levy Act 2013 will introduce a levy for using or keeping a heavy goods vehicle weighing 12 tonnes or more on a road in the UK. The levy applies to both UK and foreign registered vehicles. In order to ensure that UK registered vehicles do not pay more than their foreign counterparts VED is being reduced to its minimum level as set out in Annex I of the Directive. The amendments made by these Regulations in conjunction with amendments made to the Vehicle Excise and Registration Act 1994 (VERA 1994) will mean that UK vehicles whose plated weight is on a band limit as described above will fall into a lower band in the Directive, enabling VED to be reduced by a greater amount.

In the above example, the three-axle vehicle plated at exactly 21,000kg will not be able to be used on a road legally if it equals or exceeds that weight, and along with the changes to VERA 1994, this means that it will fall within the band spanning not less than 19,000kg to less than 21,000kg in the Directive, resulting a lower minimum rate of €144. This means that VED can be lowered further.

SI 2014/381 The Police Pensions (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 2014

These Regulations, which extend to England and Wales, came into force on **1 April 2014**.

These Regulations amend the Police Pensions Regulations 1987 and the Police Pensions Regulations 2006 in order to increase the rates of contribution payable by members of the police pension schemes governed by those Regulations.

SI 2014/423 The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Commencement No. 9, Saving Provision and Specification of Commencement Date) Order 2014

This Order is the ninth commencement order made under the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012.

The effect of the Order is that on **10 March 2014** sections 139 and 141(1) to (6), (10) and (11) of the 2012 Act together with Schedule 25 to that Act (with the exception of paragraph 4) came into force. Those provisions make amendments to the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 and make consequential amendments to other legislation.

SI 2014/395 The Police Act 1996 (Equipment) (Amendment) Regulations 2014

These Regulations came into force on **19 March 2014**.

These Regulations amend the Police Act 1996 (Equipment) Regulations 2011 (the 2011 Regulations) which impose certain requirements where specified equipment is procured for police use.

Regulation 2 of the 2011 Regulations (requirements as to design and performance of equipment) provides that a police force can only use equipment falling within the scope of a relevant national framework arrangement if the equipment has been acquired in accordance with the procedures set out in that arrangement.

These amending Regulations disapply regulation 2 of the 2011 Regulations in the specific circumstance where the relevant national framework arrangement has expired or has otherwise terminated.

SI 2014/478 Crime and Security Act 2010 (Commencement No. 7) Order 2014

This Order brings into force sections 24 to 31 of the Crime and Security Act 2010 on **8 March 2014** across police forces throughout England and Wales. Previously, sections 24 to 30 had been commenced, but only in relation to three specified police areas. These provisions include the power for an authorising officer to issue a domestic violence protection notice to an alleged perpetrator of domestic violence, and the power for a magistrates' court, on an application made by complaint by a constable, to make a domestic violence protection order.

Section 31 provides a power for the Secretary of State to issue guidance relating to the exercise by a constable of functions under these provisions, and imposes a statutory duty on constables to have regard to any such guidance when exercising functions to which the guidance relates.

SI 2014/633 The Criminal Justice Act 2003 (Commencement No. 32) Order 2014

This Order brought into force on **1 April 2014** the provisions in sections 29 and 30 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 so as to allow the Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency (DVSA), a new executive agency of the Department of Transport, to institute criminal proceedings by issuing a written charge and requisition.

The Criminal Justice Act 2003 (Commencement Order No 25) Order 2010) commenced the provisions in sections 29 and 30 of the 2003 Act in relation to the Vehicle and Operator Services Agency. VOSA has now been merged with the Driving Standards Agency to form the DVSA.

SI 2014/630 Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (Commencement No. 1) Order 2014

This Order brought into force section 147 of and Schedule 8 to the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 on **14 March 2014**.

It also brings into force section 143 and paragraphs 97 and 98 of Schedule 11 on **20 March 2014**. Section 181(1) is also commenced on **20 March 2014** but only for the purposes of the coming into force of paragraphs 97 and 98 of Schedule 11. Section 147 introduces Schedule 8 which provides powers to seize invalid passports and other invalid travel documents. Section 143 sets out and extends the powers of Local Policing Bodies to provide or commission support services for victims and witnesses of crime and anti-social behaviour. Paragraphs 97 and 98 of Schedule 11 contain amendments consequential upon section 143.

SI 2014/669 Criminal Justice (Electronic Monitoring) (Responsible Person) (No 2) Order 2014

This order came into force from **23 March 2014**.

Capita Business Services Limited has been named as the company responsible for the electronic monitoring of individuals on bail and those subject to a community order or suspended sentence, and monitoring curfew conditions and youth rehabilitation orders. The previous Order, which made provision for the persons responsible for electronic monitoring, has been revoked.

New legislation

Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

The Anti Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Bill received Royal assent on **13 March 2014** and is now an Act of Parliament.

The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 provides the College of Policing with the powers it needs to establish itself as an effective professional body for all in policing.

The Act provides a legal basis for the College of Policing to set standards of police practice and procedure through codes of practice. Chief officers must have regard to such codes of practice. The powers for the College to set codes are expected to be granted within the next few months.

The first key piece of work which the College will be seeking to have underpinned by the powers will be a Code of Ethics for all in policing.

The code is a first for policing in England and Wales and sets out the standards of behaviour expected of all officers and police staff. The code emphasises the importance of personal integrity, honesty and fairness and provides a clear framework to help resolve the professional and ethical dilemmas police officers and staff face many times every day.

The Chief executive of the College of Policing, Chief Constable Alex Marshall, said the Code of Ethics was one part of a wider programme of work on integrity in policing that is being led by the College.

In addition to the code, the College is also introducing measures including a public register of all chief officer's pay, rewards, gifts, hospitality and business interests; a disapproved register of officers and a vetting code of practice.

The Act also contains provisions about anti-social behaviour, forced marriage, crime and disorder and firearms. There are also provisions about the police; the Independent Police Complaints Commission and the Serious Fraud Office (see March Digest for further details.)

The Act comes into force on a date to be appointed by the Secretary of State by Order. So far only one Order has been made to bring into force certain provisions in the Act. The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (Commencement No.1) Order 2014 brings into force:

- section 147 of and Schedule 8 to the Act 2014 on 14 March 2014
- section 143 and paragraphs 97 and 98 of Schedule 11 on 20 March 2014

- section 181(1) on 20 March 2014 but only for the purposes of the coming into force of paragraphs 97 and 98 of Schedule 11. Section 147 introduces Schedule 8 which provides powers to seize invalid passports and other invalid travel documents. Section 143 sets out and extends the powers of Local Policing Bodies to provide or commission support services for victims and witnesses of crime and anti-social behaviour. Paragraphs 97 and 98 of Schedule 11 contain amendments consequential upon section 143.

The full text of the Act can be found at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/12/contents/enacted>

Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014

The Offender Rehabilitation Bill received Royal assent on **13 March 2014** and is now an Act of Parliament.

This Act makes a number of changes to the release arrangements set out in the Criminal Justice Act 2003 for offenders serving custodial sentences of less than 12 months and those serving sentences of between 12 months and two years. The Act is designed to ensure that all adult offenders serving custodial sentences can be supervised on release for at least 12 months.

In particular, the Act:

- applies arrangements for release under licence to offenders serving fixed-term custodial sentences of more than one day but less than 12 months
- introduces new supervision arrangements for offenders released from fixed-term custodial sentences of less than two years so that all offenders are supervised in the community for at least 12 months
- creates a new court process and sanctions for breach of supervision requirements for offenders serving fixed-term custodial sentences of less than two years
- introduces a requirement that offenders sentenced to an extended determinate sentence must have an extension period of supervision of at least one year
- introduces for offenders released from custody a new drug appointments condition for the licence or supervision period, and expands the existing drug testing requirement for licences to include Class B drugs and makes it available during the supervision period
- introduces a requirement that any juvenile who reaches his or her 18th birthday before being released from the custodial element of a Detention and Training Order (DTO) should spend at least 12 months under supervision in the community.

The Act also makes some changes to the arrangements for community orders and suspended sentence orders. In particular, it:

- creates a new 'rehabilitation activity requirement' for community orders and suspended sentence orders and in doing so abolishes the 'supervision' and 'activity' requirements
- introduces new arrangements for the designation of 'responsible officers' in relation to the supervision of offenders and makes clear that the responsibility for bringing breach action lies with the public sector
- introduces new arrangements for offenders serving community orders or suspended sentence orders to obtain permission from the responsible officer or the court before changing their place of residence.

The full text of the Act can be found at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/11/contents/enacted>

Case law

Evidence and procedure

Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis v Dawn Bangs [2014] EWHC 546 (Admin)

This case was heard in the High Court (Administrative Court) by Lord Justice Beatson and Mr Justice Griffith Williams.

Background

This was an appeal by way of case stated under section 111 of the Magistrates Court Act 1980 (the 1980 Act).

It concerns the disclosure of the Information laid before Magistrates in support of an application for a search warrant of the home address of the respondent, Ms Dawn Bangs under section 23 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 (the 1971 Act). Section 23 of the 1971 Act empowers a Justice of the Peace who is satisfied by information on oath that there is reasonable ground for suspecting that any controlled drugs are in the possession of a person on any premises to grant a warrant authorising the police to search the premises and any persons found in them. The Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis (the Commissioner) appealed against the decision of District Judge (Magistrates Courts) Crane made on 26 March 2013 at the Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court (the Magistrates' Court) to order disclosure of the Information and the notes made by the legal adviser to the Justices in Ms Bangs' case.

The Facts

On 24 September 2012, Justices of the Peace sitting at the Enfield Magistrates Court granted a search warrant authorising a search of Ms Bangs' home address at 131 Kempe Road, Enfield. Ms Bangs lived at the premises with her granddaughter and grandson. The warrant was executed by police officers at around 6:00pm. Ms Bangs was restrained using handcuffs and two uniformed female police officers conducted an intimate search of her. No illicit property was found during the search, and no property was seized.

On 30 October 2012, Ms Bangs' solicitors wrote to the Magistrates Court asking to see the Information that was laid before the Justices when the application for the warrant was made. The Commissioner objected to the disclosure of the Information on the ground of Public Interest Immunity (PII), although no explanation as to why was given.

On **2 January 2013**, the Commissioner's solicitors disclosed a redacted copy of the Information. This stated that there were 'reasonable grounds for suspecting Dawn BANGS ... of selling class A drugs – heroin – from her home address'.

A copy of the redacted Information is set out below:

THE REDACTED INFORMATION

(Passages in blue are those the Commissioner agreed to disclose after the hearing)

INFORMATION:

The informant on oath pursuant to Section 23 of the Misuse of Drugs act 1971 states that there are reasonable grounds for suspecting Dawn BANGS of 131 KEMPE ROAD, ENFIELD, EN1 4RD of selling Class A drugs – Heroin from her home address.

[4 redacted paragraphs.]

BANGS has been convicted of 12 offences to date, which include drugs offences, theft – shoplifting, receiving handling stolen goods and obtaining property by deception.

BANGS has previously received a caution for Possession of Cannabis and has two convictions of Possession of Class A – Heroin.

[4 redacted paragraphs.]

This application was made in order that police have the power to enter and search the venue including outbuildings and garages associated with this address and any vehicles at the venue under the control of the subject for Controlled substances.

Furthermore a warrant will allow Police to enter the premises should officers be refused entry at the door, thus preventing any attempt to dispose of evidence or cause sufficient damage to property to render it unidentifiable.

A warrant was executed at the address in 2008 under Section 23 Misuse of Drugs Act, Dawn BANGS was present along with others and heroin was found on her. She was arrested for possession of a Class A drug.

Intelligence suggests that two children aged 8 and 13 are residing at the address with their grandmother Dawn BANGS who is their legal guardian. Consideration would be given should a warrant be executed.

Two Staffordshire bull terriers were present at the location in 2008 search and were of good temperament. There has been no further intelligence to neither [sic] confirm nor deny the dogs are still at the location. This would be taken into consideration prior to a warrant being executed.

[Redacted paragraph.]

The covering letter sent with the Information stated that 'the Information is redacted to prevent the disclosure of information for which my client claims Public Interest Immunity'. The basis of the claim to PII was because of the nature of the source of the information in the Information, and because the Commissioner considered that disclosing it would enable the nature of the source and the source itself to be ascertained. The written submissions on behalf of Ms Bangs made by her legal representative before the District Judge and the written and oral submissions to the High court were made on the assumption that the Commissioner's case was that non-disclosure was necessary to protect an individual source of intelligence, whether by covert surveillance or human information; i.e. information from an informant.

In a letter dated 3 January 2013 to the Commissioner, Ms Bangs' solicitors asked to be supplied with a document containing the 'gist' of the Information, and an indication of its reliability and timeliness. The response, in a letter dated 9 January, stated:

...reliable information was received by police within the month prior to the application for the warrant. The Information was cross-referenced with police databases and found to be credible.

The solicitors were not satisfied with that, and, on 28 February 2013, they applied to the Magistrates Court for full disclosure of the Information or an adequate, properly particularised gist of it. On 6 March 2013 the Commissioner agreed that it was appropriate to determine the issue of disclosure at a preliminary hearing in the Magistrates' Court.

The Law

There is no express provision in legislation or the Rules as to the procedure for disclosure of an Information. The Magistrates' Court and the parties agreed that the procedure used in *EastEnders Cash & Carry v South Western Magistrates Court* [2011] EWHC 937 (Admin) and *G v Commissioner of Police* [2011] EWHC 3331 (Admin) would be followed.

Both of these cases concerned warrants to search premises, the first for firearms, and the second, for indecent photographs of children. After the warrants were executed, the owners of the properties searched requested a copy of the Information laid before the court.

In the *EastEnders* case the court initially refused to provide it, and in *G's* case the police refused to provide it. In both cases, the refusal relied on PII. As a result of this, applications for disclosure

of the Information were made to the courts. In the EastEnders case the Magistrates' Court heard representations from the police but not the claimant. In G's case, the Magistrates' Court had skeleton arguments from the claimant and the police. Both applications were granted and the Informations disclosed. After the disclosure, the applicants brought judicial review proceedings challenging the lawfulness of the decisions to grant the search warrants. The application in EastEnders case did not succeed but that in G's case did. In G's case, the Court held that the application for the warrant was unlawfully made and the warrant unlawfully granted because the Information supplied by the police in order to obtain it was inaccurate, misleading and incomplete and granted a declaration to that effect.

The Procedure in the Magistrates' Court

In the present case, the details of the material in the Information were not disclosed to Ms Bangs or her representatives. It was stated that no written basis for asserting PII was provided to Ms Bangs. The focus of the legal argument was that the 'gist provided' fell far short of a lawful 'gist' because Ms Bangs had no idea what information was provided to the Commissioner, the allegations in it, how reliable the information was, or what information contained in police databases confirmed that information.

At the hearing, after the parties introduced themselves, Ms Bangs' representatives were invited to leave the court. In the 'closed' hearing, the Court heard evidence from a police officer, and submissions on behalf of the Commissioner. After this hearing the District Judge granted the application and ordered full disclosure of the Information as well as of the legal adviser's notes taken during the hearing of the application for a warrant. She prepared a judgment containing a summary of the submissions and the evidence heard, and her conclusions on the claim for PII and the adequacy of the revised 'gist' proposed by the Commissioner. This judgment was not given in open court. Ms Bang's legal representative stated that the judge did not explain why the application had been allowed, what legal test she had applied, what authorities the Commissioner had cited in opposition to the application for disclosure, or the legal basis for the Commissioner's position.

The District Judge's Judgment

The judgment summarised the Commissioner's case that the detail of the information in the Information would result in a real risk that the risks of disclosure identified by the Commissioner would eventuate. The Commissioner submitted that the temporal and contextual material in the document would have this effect.

The District Judge also observed that much of the information in the Information about what happened at the address would have been common knowledge or obviously known to the police.

The District Judge did not accept that the revised 'gist' accurately reflected the Information. This was because 'it could give the impression that the recent information of supply from the address and the other details about what happens to the drugs was cross-referenced with other sources and this is not correct'.

The District Judge concluded that nothing in relation to the temporal or contextual material sufficed to mean that the risks to the public interest of disclosure would eventuate. She concluded that the information in the Information was not going to lead to additional speculation or risk. Because of this, she ordered disclosure.

The Commissioner considered that the District Judge had failed properly to consider whether information already disclosed was sufficient for the purpose Ms Bangs required it, that is to determine whether to challenge the procurement of the warrant or its validity, and failed properly to apply the required balancing test when rejecting the PII claim. He also questioned whether the District Judge had jurisdiction to determine Ms Bangs' application for disclosure. The Commissioner applied to the Magistrates Court for the District Judge to state a case for the opinion of the High Court which the District Judge did on 7 June 2013. Six of the fourteen paragraphs of the case (paragraphs 9 – 13), which summarised the submissions made on behalf of the Commissioner and the District Judge's findings and the names and citation of four of the authorities relied on before the District Judge were redacted.

The Procedure in the High Court

The High Court decided to consider each question separately and to hear submissions in open court on each item from both parties, and then to follow the usual PII procedure. After the submissions made on each question by both legal representatives, Counsel for the Commissioner was given an opportunity to reply. The court then invited Ms Bangs's advisers to withdraw and conducted a private hearing in which submissions were heard on behalf of the Commissioner based on the redacted material and its nature. After the private hearing, and in open court, the parties asked that the High court deal with the matter itself rather than to remit it to the magistrates' court.

The Questions for the High Court were:

- (a) Did the court have jurisdiction to hear the disclosure application?
- (b) Did the court adopt the correct procedure in relation to the disclosure application and the PII application?
- (c) Did the court apply the correct test to the disclosure application?
- (d) Was the court wrong in law to order disclosure of the information and legal advisor's notes?
- (e) What procedure should be adopted by the court when stating a case if there are issues of PII?

Did the court have jurisdiction to hear the disclosure application?

The judge found that the magistrates' court did have jurisdiction because the property owner is entitled to see the Information. The reasons given for this were that the magistrates court is under a duty to provide its reasons for granting such an application in public unless there is an

exceptional reason for not doing so, such as a valid claim to PII. The judge also found that there a similar entitlement to any further information relied upon by the magistrates when granting the warrant. The judge referred to the case of (Austen) Chief Constable of Wiltshire Police and South East Wiltshire Magistrates Court [2011] EWHC 3386 (Admin) and the judgment of Ouseley J at [49] who referred to the fact that 'since the proceedings are conducted in the absence of the party whose liberties and rights are to be infringed, it is incumbent on the applicant and the Court to be able to identify the basis of the grant of the warrant, subject to [PII]'.

Did the court adopt the correct procedure in relation to the disclosure application and the PII application?

The judge said that the approach by the District Judge in excluding Ms Bangs' representatives from the hearing when hearing the evidence from the police officer and considering the contents of the Information and submissions based on the evidence and those contents was correct. The judge stated that the Criminal Procedure Rules did not apply as this was a civil application in the magistrates court but the provisions in Part 22 of the Rules provided useful guidance as to what procedure should be adopted when considering an objection by the police to an application for disclosure of an information on PII grounds. The judge found that by analogy with Part 22, the correct approach would have been to hear such submissions as could have been heard from each side in public before moving to the private hearing.

The judge found that in this case, Ms Bangs was not prejudiced by the absence of an opportunity to make oral submissions supplementing the written submissions before the private hearing. However, it is desirable that an opportunity be given to that party to add to the written submissions. The judge also accepted that the court did not provide adequate information about its decision following the PII application.

Did the Court apply the correct test to the disclosure application?

The judge concluded that insofar as the District Judge asked whether disclosure would result in the harm identified by the Commissioner rather than whether there is a real risk of it occurring, she fell into error. He also found that the case stated did not accord appropriate weight to the officer's evidence that there was a very strong likelihood that the public interest which it was sought to protect by withholding the document would be fundamentally compromised.

Was the court wrong in law to order disclosure of the Information and the legal adviser's notes?

The judge considered the material in the Information, the officer's evidence of that material and particularly the notes of the officer's evidence. The judge concluded that this material if disclosed would, in his judgment, have compromised the public interest which it was sought to protect by withholding the document.

The judge also re-assessed the balance between the public interest in withholding the Information which would be compromised by ordering disclosure and the public interest in the administration of justice. He also considered Ms Bangs' own interest in ascertaining the reasons for the decision to grant the warrant was given and being able to assess whether it contained material which justified the warrant.

The judge said that three factors were of particular relevance to the assessment of where the balance lies.

'The first is that this was not a case in which the question of disclosure had arisen in criminal proceedings where the liberty of the defendant was at stake. The second is that the head of PII invoked by the Commissioner in this case is a particularly weighty and sensitive one. It is a context, in which the Court of Appeal Criminal Division has stated that judges should adopt a robust approach in declining to order disclosure when it is not justified. The third, which points in a different direction, is that Ms Bangs' property was entered by police officers and she was subjected to an intimate personal search.'

The Judge concluded that the public interest in withholding the Information and the legal adviser's notes is clearly stronger in the present case than the public interest in the administration of justice served by ordering disclosure. In reaching this conclusion, the Judge took into account that disclosure was to be made of the information offered by the Commissioner at the hearing before the District Judge, and the 'gist' provided to the court after the hearing.

Question 5: What procedures should be adopted by the court when stating a case if there are issues of PII?

The Judge said that there were signs of excessive caution in what information was made available to Ms Bangs and her legal representatives. The Judge accepted that in many cases, it will not be possible to say anything specific, but consideration should be given to providing as much detail as is possible to enable the points of law to be properly argued should there be an appeal against the decision.

Conclusion

The Judge allowed the appeal by the Commissioner and set aside the order by the District Judge that the information and the notes made by the legal adviser be disclosed.

The full judgment can be found at <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2014/546.html>

General police duties

DSD and another v The Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis [2014] EWHC 436 (QB)

This case was heard in the High Court (Queen's Bench Division) before Mr Justice Green.

The case concerned a claim under the Human Rights Act 1998 for declarations and damages brought by two victims of the now convicted 'black cab rapist,' John Worboys who over the course of 2002 to 2008 committed well in excess of 100 rapes and sexual assaults on women he was carrying in his cab. The victims sought a remedy for an alleged failure on the part of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to conduct an effective investigation into their respective allegations of serious sexual assault.

Pursuant to Section 1 of the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992, victims of sexual offences are entitled to anonymity during their lifetimes. In this judgment, the two Claimants are referred to as DSD, and, NBV. DSD was one of Worboys' earlier victims in 2002; NBV one of his last in 2007.

The Law

The claims are brought under Section 7 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA). Under section 6 HRA it is unlawful for a public authority to 'act in a way which is incompatible with a Convention right'. According to the HRA, 'Convention rights' includes the rights and fundamental freedoms set out in Articles 2-12 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights. It follows that it is unlawful for the MPS to act in a way that is incompatible with Articles 3 and 8, the Articles in issue in the present case. Section 7 HRA empowers victims of violations to bring proceedings before the Courts and section 8 confers upon the Courts the power to grant appropriate relief, including damages.

The real substance of this case concerned Article 3 of the Convention which provides:

No-one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

In this particular case, Article 8(1) of the Convention was of secondary importance as it did not go any further than Article 3 in a case such as this one. Article 8 concerns the right to respect for private and family life and provides as follows:

1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

2. There should be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

The Facts

Between 2002 and 2008, Worboys committed in excess of 105 rapes and sexual assaults upon women whom he was carrying late at night in the back of his black cab. Over these years he developed an ever more refined methodology for administering drugs and alcohol to these women with a view to incapacitating them so that he could then assault them. The effect upon these vulnerable women was profound. In the cases of DSD and NBV, psychiatric evidence was given to the court about the trauma they experienced at the time and subsequently. The evidence showed that the effects of the assaults had stayed with the Claimants in a variety of ways over the ensuing years manifesting themselves in depression, feelings of guilt, anxiety, and an inability to sustain relationships, including sexual relationships. The judge commented on the sense of the pain and suffering that Worboys' serial predatory behaviour exerted upon his many victims. The psychiatric and other evidence also showed that the effects rippled throughout the victim's families and their respective circles of friends.

The Judgment

The judge found the MPS liable to both DSD and NBV for breach of the Human Rights Act. This breach arose in relation to the period between 2003 (which coincides with the first complaint to police) and 2009 (when Worboys was tried). The judge made no findings about the period post 2009. It was agreed between the parties that any issues as to damages to be awarded would be dealt with separately from this particular trial and the judge proposed to proceed in the light of this ruling to consider questions of quantum with the parties.

In this case Mr Justice Green identified a series of systemic failings which went to the heart of the failure of the police to apprehend Worboys and cut short his 5-6 year spree of violent attacks. These failures included:

- a substantial failure on the part of the MPS to train relevant officers in the intricacies of sexual assaults and in particular drug facilitated sexual assaults (DFSA)
- serious failures on the ground by senior officers properly to supervise investigations by more junior officers and to ensure that they were conducting investigations in accordance with the standard procedure mandated for DFSA and as set out in MPS operating procedures

- serious failures in the collection and use of intelligence sources to cross-check complaints to see if there were linkages between them
- a failure to maintain the confidence of victims in the integrity of the investigative process and thereby to a consequential failure to create an environment where victims were incentivised to the maximum degree to bring their complaints to the police
- failures to allocate proper resources to sexual assaults including pressure from Borough management to focus resources on other allegations (of a non-sexual nature) that were easier to clear up and a resultant pressure on officers to reject complaints of sexual assault.

In addition to these systemic failures there were numerous individual omissions in the specific cases of DSD and NBV which reflect the wider systemic failings but which, when viewed in isolation, can also be said to be of sufficient seriousness such that had they not occurred the MPS would have been capable of capturing Worboys at a much earlier point in time. These failings included such matters as: failures to interview vital witnesses, failures to collect key evidence, failures to follow up on CCTV, failures to prepare properly for interviews with the suspect, etc.

The judge noted that the MPS had itself, recognised these same systemic and operational failings in its numerous reviews into the Worboys case and had indicated that it has now introduced remedial measures. No part of this trial concerned those remedial steps.

The judge concluded there was, according to well established case law, a duty imposed upon the police to conduct investigations into particularly severe violent acts perpetrated by private parties in a timely and efficient manner. However, the judge emphasised that the conditions laid down in law pursuant to which the police may be liable are relatively stringent. He accepted that it is not the case that every act or omission by the police which may be categorised as a failing will give rise to damages nor is it the case that every failure to adhere to the police's own operating standards and procedures will trigger liability. A series of exacting hurdles must be overcome before liability may be imposed. The judge was wholly satisfied that the failings in the present case were of sufficient seriousness to pass by some considerable margin the test that is to be applied to the determination of liability.

The full judgment can be found at <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/QB/2014/436.html>

Policing practice

Crime

Draft Guidance on Police Post-incident Management

The IPCC has produced additional statutory guidance on police post-incident management, designed to achieve best evidence in investigations of deaths or serious injury. The IPCC are seeking feedback on the draft guidance from stakeholders.

This statutory guidance is issued under section 22 of the Police Reform Act 2002 and applies to all 43 Home Office police forces in England and Wales. Local policing bodies, chief officers, police officers, special constables and police staff working within those forces must all have regard to the guidance. It also applies to the National Crime Agency and those agencies and non-Home Office forces that have entered into agreements with the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) under sections 26, 26A or 26B of the Police Reform Act 2002.

The draft IPCC guidance states that:

- police witnesses should be instructed not to speak (or otherwise communicate) about the incident in question
- police witnesses should be kept separate until after their detailed individual factual accounts have been taken
- any conferring between witnesses has the potential to undermine public confidence.

The draft guidance also states that the IPCC expects that anyone who has been involved in or has witnessed a death or serious injury in a professional capacity should co-operate fully with the investigation, and that failure to do so would damage not only the effectiveness of the investigation but the public's confidence in the police service as a whole.

The deadline for responding to the consultation is 5pm on 27 May 2014. The draft guidance can be found at <http://www.ipcc.gov.uk/page/consultations>

Final Report Published: Review of IPCC's Work in Investigating Deaths

The Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) has published a major report into the way it investigates deaths, signalling changes in approach and procedure, including ensuring the effective engagement of families.

The report follows a wide-ranging review, launched in autumn 2012 in response to a number of critical cases and feedback from families, individuals and organisations. The findings focus on independence, the conduct of investigations, and engagement with families and police officers.

The report sets out in detail, in Annex C, the actions that are being taken, or are planned, to change the way the IPCC works.

Actions include:

- developing internal and external expertise in areas such as mental health, discrimination, scene management and forensic science, as part of a multi-disciplinary approach
- ensuring the police officers under investigation are kept informed about progress and timescale as far as is possible
- considering any relevant interaction between the police and other agencies and informing the coroner or other agencies or oversight bodies
- providing further training and guidance to investigators, including scene management, the threshold for making decisions on criminality or misconduct, and conducting probing interviews
- developing links with people and organisations in the community, including groups that have low levels of trust in the police and the complaints system
- highlighting in reports any areas where the IPCC has been unable to gather or test evidence (including non-cooperation from witnesses) so that these can be tested in further proceedings, such as inquests
- monitoring responses to recommendations, and ensuring links with the Inspectorate of Constabulary, the College of Policing and Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC's) so that they feed into standard-setting, and are implemented.

The full report can be found at <http://www.ipcc.gov.uk/page/review-ipccs-work-relation-cases-involving-death>

Police

Ellison Independent Review Report Published

The Home Office has published a report setting out the key findings of the Ellison review. In July 2012 the Home secretary commissioned Mark Ellison QC to conduct a review examining allegations of corruption surrounding the initial investigation of the murder of Stephen Lawrence. Mr Ellison was also asked to examine whether the Metropolitan Police had evidence of corruption that it did not disclose to the Macpherson Inquiry.

The Ellison review made a number of findings in relation to the issue of corruption. The Ellison review found that there were some outstanding lines of enquiry which could be investigated both in relation to alleged corruption by a specific officer, and possibly other officers.

In response to this finding, the Home Secretary, Teresa May, has asked the Director General of the National Crime Agency to consider quickly how best an investigation could be taken forward into this aspect of Mr Ellison's findings. The Home Secretary has also asked the Chief Inspector of Constabulary to look specifically at the anti-corruption capability of forces, including professional standards departments.

The Home Secretary also announced that she would bring forward amendments to the Criminal Justice and Courts Bill to introduce a new offence of police corruption. This offence would supplement the existing offence of misconduct in public office, and will be focused clearly on those who hold police powers. The Home Secretary said that the outdated common law offence of misconduct in public office was untenable as legal basis to deal with serious issues of corruption in modern policing.

The Ellison inquiry also looked at whether there was inappropriate undercover activity directed at the Lawrence family.

Ellison reports on a 'wholly inappropriate' use of an undercover officer during the Macpherson Inquiry. Ellison found that an officer, referred to as N81, had been deployed into one of the groups seeking to influence the Lawrence family campaign, while the Macpherson Inquiry was ongoing.

In addition to this, Ellison reported on the activities of the Metropolitan Police's Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) more widely and commented on the extraordinary level of secrecy observed as to any disclosure that might risk exposing an undercover officer. In identifying the possibility that SDS secrecy may have caused miscarriages of justice, Mark Ellison recommends a further review to identify the specific cases affected. The Home Secretary has accepted this recommendation and Mark Ellison will lead this work, working with the CPS and reporting to the Attorney General.

The full report of the Ellison inquiry can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/stephen-lawrence-independent-review>

Independent Review of the Police Federation

The Report of the Independent Review of the Police Federation of England and Wales has been published. This is the Final Report of the review panel set up in Spring 2013 by the Police Federation and chaired by Sir David Normington.

The Review undertook a large-scale consultation exercise involving more than 10,000 members, Police Federation staff and representatives, and stakeholders from across the policing world and beyond. The Independent Review Panel reviewed the full range of evidence in concluding its analysis and making a series of recommendations for reform.

A significant programme of change is proposed in the Final Report. The report raises concerns about the Police Federation's: lack of openness and transparency about its affairs and finances; weak accountability to members and the public; its inability to promote good behaviour and professional standards; and internal divisions that have hampered its effectiveness and reputation. Members, it says, have lost confidence in it and it is losing its influence in representing its members.

The report explains how the Police Federation must regain the trust of its members and the public. It must provide better value for money for members' subscriptions and for public resources it receives. It has to increase its professionalism particularly in its standards of behaviour and conduct. It has to become more unified and speak with a single voice.

There are thirty-six recommendations for reform set out in the report. They include:

- the Federation should adopt a new statement of intent which reflects the Police Federation's commitment to act in the public interest, with public accountability, alongside accountability to its members. This should be incorporated in legislation as soon as practicable
- a new ethics, standards and performance process for Police Federation representatives
- the publication of all Police Federation accounts and the expenses and hospitality received by individual officers
- a new independent reference group to evaluate how the Police Federation is meeting its public interest obligations
- streamlining and professionalisation of Federation representative structures
- the abolition of separate committees for each rank which have become divisive and create unnecessary cost

- a new National Council comprised of representatives from all the 43 branches should elect a National Board and hold it to account while ensuring that the Board has the authority to provide leadership to the Federation
- more accountability to members including the direct election of the National Chair; and
- an initial 25 percent reduction in member subscriptions for one year in 2015 financed by the reserves from the rank central committees with the possibility of further reductions in future years.

The full report can be found at http://www.thersa.org/data/assets/pdf_file/0004/1538230/RSA_Police_Federation_Review_Report_FINAL.pdf

Home Office Circular 003/2014: increased police officer pension contributions 2014 to 2015

This circular publishes the Home Secretary's decision to increase police pension contributions payable by police officers, with effect from 1 April 2014. This concerns contributions made under the Police Pension Regulations 1987 and the Police Pension Regulations 2006.

Further to increases implemented in April 2012 and April 2013, and following further consultation with the Police Negotiating Board, there will be implemented an increase in employee contributions, the details of which can be found in Annex A (table showing the increase in police officer contributions for tiers 1,2 and 3).

For officers who pay reduced contributions owing to exclusion from ill-health provisions of either the 1987 or 2006 schemes, the contribution rate will remain 3.5% less than the 'full' rates outlined at Annex A of the Circular.

Full details of the changes to contribution rates and regulations which bring these into effect can be found in the Police Pensions (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 2014.

The Circular can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/circular-0032014-increased-police-officer-pension-contributions-2014-to-2015>

Criminal justice system

Domestic Violence Action Plan 2014

On **8 March 2014**, to coincide with International Women's Day, the government published an updated violence against women and girls action plan.

This third revision of the action plan updates the efforts underpinning that strategy, and sets out significant progress since the last report was published a year ago. The updated plan includes a renewed focus on early intervention, supporting effective local approaches, driving a culture change and measuring outcomes.

The new plan sets out the Home Office plans to: protect victims through early intervention rolling out programmes such as Clare's Law and domestic violence protection orders; support effective local approaches by giving local commissioners the information they need to tackle violence against women and girls; ensure that other programmes, such as tackling sexual violence against children and young people, gang related exploitation of girls and modern slavery support the government approach to ending violence against girls and women.

Particular actions specified in the plan include:

- completion of the domestic violence disclosure scheme (Clare's Law) pilot and the announcement that the scheme will be rolled out nationally from March 2014, allowing the police to disclose information to the public about a partner's previous violent offending and thereby empowering people to make an informed decision about the future of a relationship
- evaluation of the domestic violence protection order pilot, and the announcement that this too will be rolled out nationally from March 2014, preventing perpetrators of violence from returning to their home for up to 28 days, giving the victim time to consider their options
- a review of the police response to domestic violence by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, which will report by April 2014
- setting out a programme of work through the National Group on Sexual Violence against Children and Vulnerable People to prevent sexual abuse happening in the first place; to protect children online; to make sure the police can identify and deal with abuse; and ensure victims are at the heart of the criminal justice system

- engaging closely with local commissioners, including issuing a violence against women and girls fact pack and holding a conference on commissioning for Police and Crime Commissioners.

The full action plan can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/ending-violence-against-women-and-girls-in-the-uk#case-studies>

Clare's Law Implementation

The Home Secretary, Teresa May, has announced the national roll-out of Clare's law, a scheme allowing police to disclose details of an abusive partners' past. The roll-out, coinciding with International Women's Day, follows a 14 month pilot in four police force areas, which provided more than 100 people with potentially life-saving information.

The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme is named after Clare Wood who was brutally murdered 5 years ago by her former partner George Appleton, who had a record of violence against women.

Domestic Violence Protection Orders (DVPOs) are also being rolled out across England and Wales. This new power will enable police and magistrates' courts to provide protection to victims in the immediate aftermath of a domestic violence incident.

DVPOs can be used to provide immediate protection to a victim where there is not enough evidence to charge an alleged perpetrator and provide protection to victims via bail conditions. A DVPO can last for up to 28 days, during which time the perpetrator can be prevented from having contact with the victim.

DVPOs are designed to give victims the time and space they need to make decisions about their options and future safety with the help of a support agency.

The implementation of Clare's Law and DVPOs are among the measures introduced to tackle violence against women and girls and form an integral part of the government's Call to End Violence against Women and Girls Action Plan 2014.

The plan includes a commitment to put in place a new code of practice to ensure that safe addresses of victims of domestic and sexual abuse are protected. This will take effect where victims might otherwise have to reveal details of their address to people who could threaten them, for example in court cases unrelated to their abuse, or when required for their children's school records, or the family's access to benefits.

The College of Policing has now issued a briefing for all officers, police staff and those in specialist public protection roles, to help them follow the rules of disclosure. The briefing explains the purpose of the scheme, the legislation surrounding it and what information police should gather before an application for disclosure is considered.

The second chapter of the briefing describes the two routes in the scheme - 'Right to ask' and 'Right to know'.

A 'Right to know' means potential victims can be given information, even if they have not asked for it, if the police or partner agencies are aware that a partner is potentially putting them at risk of domestic abuse.

The briefing also covers the key principles that have to be taken into account before making a decision to disclose information and ensure that protection of the person at risk is maintained.

It also outlines for police what will happen once a decision is made to disclose or not, and how the safety and protection of the potential victim and the risk posed by the potential offender is managed.

For more information about the briefing, contact the National Public Protection Training Co-ordinator sharon.stratton@college.pnn.police.uk or visit the Domestic Abuse, Honour Based Violence, Stalking and Harassment community on POLKA.

Further details about Clare's law can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/clares-law-rolled-out-nationally-on-international-womens-day>

Protecting the public Supporting the fight against crime

As the professional body for policing, the College of Policing sets high professional standards to help forces cut crime and protect the public. We are here to give everyone in policing the tools, skills and knowledge they need to succeed. We will provide practical and common-sense approaches based on evidence of what works.

Contact us

To find out more about the Digest or to request this document in an alternative format:

Call: 0800 496 3322

Email: digestregistration@college.pnn.police.uk

Web: www.college.police.uk/digest

Interested in learning more about the College of Policing?
Why not subscribe to our monthly newsletter by emailing your details to **marketing@college.pnn.police.uk**

College of Policing Limited is a company registered in England and Wales.

Registered number: 8235199

VAT registered number: 152023949

Registered office: College of Policing Limited, Leamington Road,
Ryton-on-Dunsmore, Coventry CV8 3EN