

Days from receipt to completion	Summary of allegation(s)	Complaint Category and type	Complaint Outcome (Humberside Police)	Review Outcome (LPB)	Recommendations to Force	Force response to Recommendation
Reporting Period - 2021/22 - Quarter 1						
19 days	<p>1. The complainant is dissatisfied with the investigation of a fraud where they were a suspect including a lack of updates.</p> <p>2. The complainant is dissatisfied that police retained their money following an investigation where they were a suspect.</p>	Handling of or damage to property/premises	<p>1. Service provided by police was not acceptable</p> <p>2. Service provided by police was acceptable</p>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
12 days	The complainant is dissatisfied as they state they were told to leave custody at 11:50pm at night without any assistance from the police to ensure their safe return.	Delivery of duties and services General level of service	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
2 days	Complainant was dissatisfied with the police management of an investigation where they are the victim. Complainant withdrew initial allegations and wanted the investigation to stop.	Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
18 days	The complainant alleges that the officer responsible for stopping him abused his powers by threatening to arrest the complainant for not removing their helmet, prior to confirming their details.	Police powers, policies and procedures Stops and stop and search	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
35 days	<p>1. The complainant is dissatisfied with how police dealt with a situation involving them and a dog.</p> <p>2. The complainant alleges that when they were in custody they were not allowed to put their side of the story forward, instead they were charged without interview.</p> <p>3. The complainant is dissatisfied that following their arrest and interview on ***** police are still in possession of their property including their telephone.</p>	<p>1. Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact</p> <p>2. Police powers, policies and procedures Bail, identification and interview procedures</p> <p>3. Handling of or damage to property/premises</p>	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
18 days	<p>1. The complainant is dissatisfied that the officer has not recorded the emotional harm suffered by their children as he did not have any methods to record the information or have BWV activated.</p> <p>2. The complainant alleges that a DASH risk assessment was not recorded with them at the time of the incident.</p> <p>3. The complainant alleges that the officer stated he would refer the matter to social services but this does not appear to have been done.</p> <p>4. The complainant alleges that the FCR supervisor was unhelpful, flippant and unwilling to take on board any issues they raised.</p>	Delivery of duties and services General level of service	<p>1. Service provided by police was acceptable</p> <p>2. Service provided by police was acceptable</p> <p>3. Service provided by police was not acceptable</p> <p>4. Not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not</p>	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

41 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the circumstances of them being invited to sign a Community Resolution document on 23 March 2021.	Delivery of duties and services Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable	Not R&P Upheld	That Humberside Police consider: a) all the papers generated by the complaint handling and review report to be forwarded to the force ICU so that they can rule on the complainant's request to have the Community Resolution Notice quashed, rather than have them write in for a third time to the force. b) The complainant is advised that this is what will happen, and any decision that is made will be communicated back to them c) that Reflective Practice Review Process (RPRP) is considered for the officer, in relation to how they dealt with this case. RPRP is a formal review process that an officer goes through with a line manager to address an identified under-performance issue. The officer's manner was professional and seems totally well intentioned, but it would be beneficial for them to reflect on how their lack of introduction, or explanation of the offence and notice, plus lack of knowledge of what the texts said, undermined their work. This left a clear confusion on the complainant's part and an abiding sense of injustice. The reflection would help ensure similar issues do not arise in the future and the officer's performance is improved.	Accepted
16 days	1. The complainant alleges they have been let down by the Police, due to the lack of investigation into the report they made.  2. The complainant alleges there was a lack of communication and support by the officers who dealt with the allegations and believes they were only interested in the sexual abuse and didn't take into consideration the other forms of abuse that they suffered; physical and emotional.	A. Delivery of duties and services. A4. General level of service.  A. Delivery of duties and services. A1. Police Action following contact.	A. Service provided by Police was acceptable.  Explanation provided.	Not upheld	N/A	N/A
24 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that Humberside Police refused to assist in locating their son after he had left hospital before being assessed for his mental health and drug taking.	A. Delivery of duties and Services A4 General level of service	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
29 days	The complainant states that the evidence presented by the police in a case of speeding and wearing of an inappropriate visor is incorrect in law, also that the evidence tendered in the officer's statement is an incorrect version of what occurred and what was said irrespective of the Body Worn Recording.	B Police Powers and Procedures B7 Evidential Procedures	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
25 days	The complainant feels the police and in particular the officer in the case are not supporting or listening to their wishes or reasons why they wish the police to withdraw an allegation of Domestic Abuse against their partner.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
24 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the progress of an investigation which was reported to the police in June of 2018.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
22 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the investigation of a burglary where they are the victim.	A. Delivery of duties and Services A4 General level of service	It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

23 days	The complainant alleges the police did not investigate their allegations of sexual assault at the time they happened and did not speak with their mother, and when they did approach them a year later in a prison public visiting room, he felt too uncomfortable due to the setting and other people being present, to be confident to discuss it.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	1. Service provided by police was not acceptable (part 1 of complaint) 2. It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not (part 2 of complaint)	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
15 days	1. The complainant alleges that an officer who is dealing with an investigation where they are the victim, has lied, changed her mind, and put the case in jeopardy. 2. The complainant alleges that an officer has shouted at them over the telephone and made them cry.	A. Delivery of duties and Services A4 General level of service	1. Service provided by Police was acceptable (part 1 of complaint) 2. It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not. (part 2)	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
25 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with numerous aspects of them being stopped by the police on *****	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
25 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that officers entered their address on ***** , that they snooped about and escalated the situation	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
17 days	The complainant is dissatisfied that numerous police officers have not replied to communication from them.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
15 days	1. The complainant was involved in a RTC. He alleges the attending officers were inept. 2. The complainant alleges that one officer showed bias.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact (Part 1)  H. Individual Behaviour H4. Lack of fairness and impartiality	Service provided by Police was acceptable (Part 1)  It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not (part 2)	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
16 days	The complainant alleges that their tenancy has been undermined by a new landlord who has tried to evict them. They complain that the police have not taken sufficient action to protect them as a vulnerable seriously ill victim and nor have they relied upon harassment or eviction laws to prevent the new landlord from continuing threats and eviction.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by police was not acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
16 days	The complainant alleges that an Acer tablet computer was removed from their house during an investigation, but when it was returned it was damaged and unusable.	C. Handling of or damage to property/premises	It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
16 days	1. The complainant alleges that the phone was put down on them.  2. The complainant alleges they have been accused of being rude by the police which they find upsetting and causes them harassment. Also does not like being interrupted when they are speaking.  3. The complainant alleges their calls to the FCR have not brought them the appropriate outcome they desired regarding a report of intimidation by cyclists riding on the pavement and theft of her car.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A4. General level of service  A. Delivery of Duties and Services A4. General level of service  A. Delivery of Duties and Services A4. General level of service	Service provided by Police was acceptable  Service provided by Police was acceptable  Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A

10 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the investigation into a Road Traffic Collision which occurred in December 2020	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
7 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the service they have received from Humberside Police concerning investigations where they are the victim.	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
7 days	The complainant is dissatisfied with the standard of riding of a police motorcyclist	A. Delivery of Duties and Services A1 Police action following contact	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
21 days	The complainant is dissatisfied at the lack of action taken by local PCSOs and the police in general in regards to youths on bikes in the area.	A. Delivery of duties and Services A4 General level of service	It is not possible to determine whether the service provided was acceptable or not.	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld	N/A	N/A
17 days	<p>1. The complainant alleges that a neighbour shouted at them through a car window, which they reported to police who visited the neighbour but took no action.</p> <p>2. The complainant alleges an officer failed to obtain a duty solicitor for their husband who was to be interviewed at the police station.</p> <p>3. The complainant alleges that a false report was made to the police about their relative. The complainant is dissatisfied with this report not being linked with ongoing issues associated with a neighbour they have ongoing complaints against.</p> <p>4. The complainant alleges that prejudicial comments were made by PC xxxxx during contact over a reported incident.</p>	<p>A. Delivery of Duties and Services A2 Decisions</p> <p>B. Police powers, policies and procedures. B6. Bail, identification and interview procedures</p> <p>B. Police powers, policies and procedures. B7. Evidential procedures</p> <p>H. Individual Behaviour H2. Impolite and intolerant actions</p>	<p>1. Service provided by Police was acceptable.</p> <p>2. Service provided by Police was not acceptable.</p> <p>3. Service provided by Police was acceptable.</p> <p>4. Service provided by Police was acceptable.</p>	Not R&P Upheld	<p>I recommend that the force arrange for an experienced detective manager (DI xxxxx may be suitable given his involvement so far) to fully review all matters, taken together, involving the allegations and counter allegations between xxxxx and the xxxxx family. The purpose of the review is to identify whether all matters have been addressed and if the actions taken against xxxxx were justified in law. A full explanation should then be given to the complainant, and any necessary remedial action taken to address any shortcomings which may include the fact that xxxxx does not appear to have been investigated for the original allegation.</p> <p>I further recommend that Humberside Police review the VI letter content and amend as appropriate to ensure it is legally correct, understandable and will avoid further misunderstandings.</p> <p>I also recommend that the force amend the outcome for element 4 to 'not acceptable' and provide the complainant a suitable apology in respect of that element.</p>	Accepted
19 days	The complainant alleges that Humberside Police have rung a childrens' activity instructor telling them that they are a risk to children. They find it concerning that police have received an allegation and without investigating or making them aware, have labelled them an alleged sex offender. They consider this discriminatory as they have mental health problems	D. Access and/or disclosure of information. D2. Disclosure of information.	Service provided by Police was acceptable	Reasonable & Proportionate Not upheld		N/A