

Report of a Complaint Handling Review in relation to Strathclyde Police

under section 35(1) of the Police Public Order
and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 2006

Summary and Key Findings

The applicant's son was arrested by Strathclyde Police for an alleged assault and breach of the peace following an argument with his former girlfriend. At his subsequent trial the applicant's son was found not guilty.

The applicant has raised complaints about the failure of police officers to obtain a statement from a witness; the decision-making process leading to his son's arrest; the procedures relating to the submission of counter allegations by the applicant's son; and the use of language by a police officer towards his son. As a result of these complaints Strathclyde Police issued advice to three of its officers.

The Commissioner found that the complaints were handled reasonably by Strathclyde Police. However, he has identified as a learning point the need to produce and maintain written records of all meetings held with complainers to ensure that complaint handling practices are transparent, auditable and accountable.

The Commissioner's role

Section 35 of the Police Public Order and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act ("the Act") gives the Commissioner the power to examine the manner in which a policing body has dealt with a "relevant" complaint, as defined in the Act.

The Commissioner is independent of the police service and performs his functions in a fair and impartial manner. Before considering a complaint, the Commissioner's office obtains all papers held by the policing body against which the complaint has been made. These papers are considered alongside information provided by the applicant. The Commissioner then assesses whether the policing body's handling of the complaint was reasonable in all the circumstances. The Commissioner will look at the entire handling process, from the initial investigation by the policing body to the final response issued to the applicant. Among the factors which the Commissioner takes into account are the following:

- whether the policing body's response to the complaint is supported by all material information available;
- whether in dealing with the complaint the policing body has adhered to all relevant policies, procedures and legal provisions;
- where the complaint has resulted in the policing body identifying measures necessary to improve its service, whether these measures are adequate and have been implemented;
- whether the policing body's response to the complaint is adequately reasoned; and
- whether the policing body has communicated with the applicant in a reasonable manner.

Background

On 11 June 2007, an allegation of breach of the peace and assault was made against the applicant's son, Mr A, by three females, one of whom was Mr A's former girlfriend. The allegations were made following a dispute between Mr A and the three females at the home of Mr A's aunt, Miss B, earlier the same evening. Following the dispute, the three females attended a police station to make a complaint about Mr A. The females alleged that they had attended the house to recover a mobile phone and that a dispute had ensued resulting in Mr A shouting, swearing and assaulting his former girlfriend by throwing the mobile phone at her.

After obtaining statements from the three witnesses, Constable C concluded that there was sufficient evidence to arrest Mr A for breach of the peace and assault. He then asked Constables D and E to carry out the arrest. At 3 am on 12 June 2007 Mr A was arrested by Constables D and E at the home of Miss B.

Mr A states that Miss B asked Constables D and E if she could provide her version of events and was told that she would need to speak to the officer dealing with the incident (Constable C). According to the applicant Miss B advised one of the officers that she wished to make a complaint about the females who had attended her house and was told to attend a police station and deal with Constable C.

Mr A was taken to a police station and, as the incident was deemed to be domestic in nature, detained in custody before appearing in court later the same day. After being granted bail, Mr A returned to the police station with his mother, Mrs F, and Miss B to make a counter allegation of breach of the peace against the three females. They were told by police staff on duty at the time that it would be best if they made the counter allegation to the officer in charge of the case,

Constable C. Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F returned to the police station later the same day where Mr A made to Constable C a counter allegation of breach of the peace.

Mr A states that during his meeting with Constable C the latter told him that he had to feel like “his life was in danger” to make such a counter allegation. Mr A also states that after he requested that Mrs F be present during his interview, Constable C stated “are you sure you want her here, you’re a big boy, you’re nineteen”. Miss B and Mrs F both confirm in their statements that Constable C said this to Mr A. However, Constable C denies making any of these comments.

At his subsequent court appearance Mr A was found not guilty in respect of both charges.

The Complaints

Based on the contents of the application form, and the information obtained from Strathclyde Police, the Commissioner has identified the following complaints:

- (1) that police officers refused to take a statement from Miss B;
- (2) that police officers would not accept counter charges from Mr A;
- (3) that Constable C made inappropriate remarks to Mr A;
- (4) that no senior officers were made aware of the arrest of the applicant’s son;
- (5) that the incident involving the applicant’s son was considered as a domestic dispute; and
- (6) that Strathclyde Police’s responses were incomplete and unclear

The applicant has made complaint 6 to the Commissioner’s office only and accordingly Strathclyde Police has not had an opportunity to consider it. However, given that it concerns the manner in which Complaints 1-5 were handled by Strathclyde Police the Commissioner has included it in his review.

The Commissioner’s Review

Background to the review

The applicant first wrote to Strathclyde Police on 15 January 2008 detailing complaints 1, 2 and 3. His complaints were passed to a local division for investigation and Inspector G was appointed as investigating officer. During Inspector G’s investigation, statements were obtained from Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F. A Complaint about the Police (CAP) form was also completed, which categorised the complaints as neglect of duty and irregularity of procedure against Constables D and E; and incivility against Constable C. Statements were subsequently obtained from these officers.

A report on the circumstances surrounding the complaint was submitted to Chief Inspector G on 27 March 2008. On the same day Chief Inspector H provided a written response to Mr A in relation to the applicant’s complaint, as it was deemed by Chief Inspector H more appropriate to correspond directly with Mr A rather than the applicant

On 3 April 2008, the applicant attended a police office advising that he was dissatisfied with the response he had received from Chief Inspector H. On 8 April 2008, Superintendent J and Chief Inspector H met with the applicant and agreed to conduct a full review of the circumstances behind

the complaint. During this meeting, the applicant detailed complaints 4 and 5 and reiterated complaints 1 and 2.

On 22 May 2008, Superintendent J wrote to the applicant with the outcome of his review. On 30 May 2008, the applicant called Superintendent J to explain that he was not happy with the outcome of his complaints.

On 29 May 2008, the applicant wrote to the Area Procurator Fiscal requesting that he/she investigate an alleged failure by Strathclyde Police to take a statement from Miss B. This was with a view to criminal charges being brought against Constables D and E. The Area Procurator Fiscal responded on 3 June 2008, stating:

"I have to advise you that, in the circumstances of this case in which the officers had obtained accounts from three witnesses providing a sufficiency of evidence against your son on charges of breach of the peace and assault, their decision not to take a statement from [Miss B] would not provide a basis for investigation of any criminal conduct by the officers."

On 19 June 2008, the applicant called the Complaints and Discipline Branch of Strathclyde Police regarding his continued dissatisfaction with the responses he had received. During this call Superintendent K advised the applicant that a further review of his file would be undertaken and that a letter would be sent advising him of Strathclyde Police's final position.

On 15 July 2008, Chief Superintendent L wrote to the applicant with the outcome of her review. In her response, Chief Superintendent L stated:

"I am satisfied that all reasonable enquiries were carried out into the various allegations and that when considered together, Chief Inspector [H]'s and Superintendent [J]'s responses comprehensively cover all material aspects of your complaint..."

... I can confirm that taking account of the whole circumstances of you and your son's complaint, it is not appropriate at this time to take formal action against any of the officers subject to complaint. I would, however, emphasise that where there has been an acknowledged weakness or omission, corrective action and advice has been undertaken by a senior officer and the officers concerned have been left in no doubt as to how to conduct themselves in future."

Chief Superintendent L's letter concluded by informing the applicant that, should he remain dissatisfied, he could refer the matter to the Commissioner's office.

The applicant first contacted the Commissioner's office by telephone on 15 May 2008. He thereafter submitted an application form on 14 October 2008.

The remainder of this section sets out the Commissioner's views on the manner in which the applicant's complaints were handled by Strathclyde Police. Each complaint is set out in turn and is followed by details of Strathclyde Police's handling of it and the Commissioner's views on this.

Complaint 1: alleged refusal to take a statement from Miss B

The applicant is unhappy that a statement was not taken from Miss B when Constables D and E attended to arrest his son. The applicant believes that it is police's duty to investigate all evidence and not merely those who "get to the police first".

Internal Handling

As noted above, Inspector G was tasked with investigating this complaint. His report concluded:

“As indicated [in the applicant’s] letter he is clearly unhappy that no statement was taken at the time of his son’s arrest from the witness [Miss B]. Whilst attending to note his wife’s statement, this point was discussed with both [the applicant and his wife] and they appeared happy with an explanation provided by the reporting officer concerning a ‘defence witness’ and how their evidence would normally be introduced and obtained.”

Chief Inspector H’s letter to the applicant of 27 March 2008 stated:

“[Miss B] wished to provide the officers with some additional information that related to the incident leading to your arrest. The officers considered that this additional information was more appropriate to be utilised in the way of a defence in any subsequent proceedings... It is my opinion however that all available evidence should be presented to the Procurator Fiscal at the earliest opportunity and you can be assured that I will personally make my views clear to the officers concerned.”

Superintendent J’s letter to the applicant of 22 May 2008 stated:

“The understanding of the officers present was that the evidence offered by this third party [Miss B] was more in keeping with a defence statement and that was the advice they provided to her. Having examined the available evidence I am satisfied that the advice offered by the officers was given in good faith although I do accept that it would have been a more preferable position to note the statement of that third party at that time... At that time there was a sufficiency of evidence to arrest and any additional information would not have changed that course of action.”

Consideration

Inspector G’s report commented that the applicant and his wife appeared happy with his explanation of Miss B’s potential role as a defence witness. However, by stating this Inspector G appears not to have understood the issue underlying the applicant’s complaint, namely, that when investigating such allegations, police officers should obtain statements from all potential witnesses and submit details of these to the Procurator Fiscal for consideration.

During subsequent reviews, both Chief Inspector H and Superintendent J correctly identified the essence of the complaint. Although Superintendent J conceded that it would have been preferable if a statement had been obtained from Miss B, the Commissioner does not consider that this goes far enough. In terms of section 17(1)(b) of the Police (Scotland) Act 1967, a constable’s duties include taking all lawful measures and making such reports to the prosecutor as may be necessary for bringing offenders to justice. Simply because a witness to an event might ultimately give an account in support of a suspect’s defence does not mean constables can legitimately exclude such witnesses from their enquiries. It is important to recognise that the emphasis of section 17(1)(b) is the bringing of offenders to justice, not suspects.

In the Commissioner’s view, Chief Inspector H’s response (quoted above) is more in keeping with a constable’s duty under section 17(1)(b). According to his letter, Chief Inspector H advised the applicant that he would make his views known to Constables D and E. In the Commissioner’s view, this represents a reasonable response to the applicant’s complaint.

Whilst Miss B’s statement does not specifically detail her interaction with Constables D and E, both officers state that Miss B told them that she had overheard the argument between Mr A and the three females. From the information supplied to the Commissioner, it appears that Miss B may also have witnessed Mr A’s behaviour towards the three females.

Although there appears to have been sufficient evidence to arrest Mr A, the Commissioner agrees with Chief Inspector H's assessment that a statement should have been taken from Miss B and submitted to the Procurator Fiscal. Any other approach might result in potentially relevant evidence not being considered by the Procurator Fiscal.

Overall, the Commissioner considers that this complaint was handled by Strathclyde Police in a reasonable manner.

Complaint 2: officers would not accept counter allegations from Mr A

The applicant states that on two occasions police officers would not accept counter allegations against Mr A's former girlfriend. The first occasion allegedly took place at Miss B's home during the arrest of Mr A. The second occasion allegedly took place later the same day when Miss B and Mrs F visited a police station. On the second occasion it appears that an unidentified police officer or member of police staff was of the view that the counter allegation should be made to Constable C.

The applicant has also raised concerns that Strathclyde Police has been unable to identify the officer with whom the family spoke with at the police station. In his letter of complaint to the police the applicant asked why it was necessary for the officer who dealt with the original enquiry to deal with follow-up allegations.

Internal Handling

Inspector G's report concluded:

"It should be noted that when [Miss B]'s statement was noted she confirmed that she did not in fact intimate that she wanted to make a complaint, but it has to be made clear that she was indeed ignorant of the fact she could, having only later realised after speaking with [Mr A]'s solicitor..."

... In relation to the 'non recording' of the complaint by police staff at [a police station] on the morning of Tuesday 12 June 2008, all the witnesses are unsure who exactly they spoke to, with conflicting information as to whether they were male/female, support or police staff, or indeed what rank they may have been. All were questioned by the reporting officer regarding their appearance (dark or white shirts) but none had any clear recollection. If the Complainer and the witnesses had been more forceful and insistent that their complaint be taken, clearly any member of staff within the front office that morning that dealt with them, SHOULD HAVE noted the complaint AT THAT TIME."

Chief Inspector H's letter to the applicant in response to the complaints states:

"It would have been helpful if the staff at the time could have been more proactive to attend to your wishes. I do believe, however that you accepted the advice of staff on duty at that time and agreed to re-attend to speak to the original reporting officer... I am sorry that you were inconvenienced by having to return to speak to the reporting officer of the original case to have your counter allegation noted."

After meeting with the applicant on 8 April 2008, Superintendent J responded to this complaint in his letter to the applicant dated 22 May 2008, stating:

"The next question you raise is in relation to a visit by your wife, your son and the third party to a Police Office where a request was made to bring charges against three of the witnesses to the original incident. I understand that the advice offered at that time was that the police officer dealing with the original matter would have to deal with this matter also."

In response to your specific question I must advise you that it is not a requirement that the original officer deal with the circumstances. That said there is merit in limiting the number of police officers that deal with a particular incident specifically given that the officers dealing with the original matter are fully conversant with the circumstances of the people that may have been involved. I accept that the more preferable position would have been for the officer to note basic details and perhaps pass them onto the reporting officer. The original officer could then have taken forward any necessary enquiry. It is therefore regrettable that this initial action was not taken during the course of that original visit to the police office.”

In his letter Superintendent J also addressed the applicant's concerns regarding Strathclyde Police's inability to identify the officer to whom the family spoke at the police station when requesting to make a counter allegation. Superintendent J states:

“At the interview we explained that depending on the circumstances there could be numerous members of staff within the office who were not necessarily detailed duties in the office but rather may have been passing through at that time and assisted bar staff. I agree with you when you reiterate your concern with regard to not being able to identify those individuals and that of course is regrettable. Nevertheless given the circumstances prevailing at that time and the possibility that the staff spoken to may have moved on to other duties it is simply not possible for us to identify them at this stage. In that regard you may also wish to be aware that we spoke to the witnesses who were present at the time and they were unable to give a description that would assist us identifying the officers that they spoke to.”

Consideration

In relation to the applicant's allegation that the police officers who arrested Mr A would not accept Miss B's counter charge there appears to be confusion between the applicant's view of these events and that of Miss B. In her statement relating to the attendance of police officers at her home Miss B states:

“I spoke with the female officer, but I did not at this time intimate that counter charges could be considered only because I had no idea that I could.”

In the Commissioner's view Miss B's statement rules out any possibility of Constable D or Constable E refusing to accept her counter allegation given that she herself was unaware that she could make a such an allegation at that time.

Miss B and Mrs F state that later the same day they attended a police station. According to the applicant, during that visit a police officer refused to accept a counter allegation of breach of the peace against Mr A's former girlfriend. Miss B states that the following occurred after she requested to make a counter allegation:

“We were then spoken to by another person, a male officer, I think possibly a Sergeant but then I'm not sure, who said that I couldn't counter charge that it would have to be [Mr A]. He advised us that it would be better to contact or return later that night when the night shift started and speak with the officer who had dealt with [Mr A]'s arrest.”

From the information available to the Commissioner, Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F returned to the police station later that night as requested. At this time Mr A lodged with Constable C a counter allegation against his former girlfriend.

As noted above, Strathclyde Police has not been able to identify the officer who asked the family to return to the police station to speak to Constable C. Superintendent J confirmed that witnesses in the area of the charge bar at that time were interviewed but these enquiries failed to identify any

individual who may have provided this advice to Miss B and Mrs F. The Commissioner notes that there is no record of these interviews included in the papers that were passed to his office. This is an issue which the Commissioner has brought to Strathclyde Police's attention in another recently published case (reference PCCS/00434/PF-SP). In light of this, the Commissioner recommends that Strathclyde Police reminds all officers who deal with complaints of the importance of ensuring accurate and auditable records of their investigations.

In the Commissioner's view, the officer who asked the family to return to the police station to speak to Constable C did not refuse to accept the counter allegation. Rather he was suggesting that the complaint should be made to Constable C as the officer responsible for handling the enquiry. Inspector G concluded that any member of staff could have noted the complaint from Miss B and accordingly there was no need for this officer to have asked Miss B to return to speak to Constable C. Superintendent J also addressed this in his letter, stating that it would have been preferable for the officer concerned to have noted the counter allegations and passed this information to Constable C.

It is clear that counter allegations were accepted by Constable C when Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F returned to the police station later that evening. Chief Inspector H issued an apology to the applicant for the inconvenience of having to return to the police office to make these allegations. In the Commissioner's view, this represents a reasonable response to the complaint.

In the Commissioner's view, this complaint was dealt with in a reasonable manner. Accordingly, no further action is required of Strathclyde Police in this connection.

Complaint 3: Constable C made inappropriate remarks to Mr A

Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F all state that Constable C made inappropriate remarks to Mr A. These remarks were allegedly made when Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F returned to the police station to make counter allegations against Mr A's former girlfriend. The alleged comments by Constable C were made in response to two requests made by Mr A. The first request was to make a counter allegation of breach of the peace against his former girlfriend. In response to this Constable C allegedly stated that in order to make this allegation Mr A would have to feel like "his life was in danger". The statements of each member of the family suggest that Constable C was unconvinced that Mr A could feel that his life was placed in danger by three females. The second request was that Mrs F be present when Mr A provided his statement to the police. Mr A stated that, in response to this request, Constable C asked, "Are you sure you want her here, you're a big boy, you are nineteen". Both Miss B and Mrs F state that Constable C made this comment.

Internal Handling

Inspector G's report did not specifically address this complaint.

Chief Inspector H's letter states:

"I am personally disappointed that you find this officer's conduct to be so alarming to you and your relatives... Given the evidence before me I can advise that I will carry out your request and inform the officer concerned that I am disappointed in the circumstances that were outlined by yourself and pertinent witnesses".

Superintendent J provided a response to this complaint in his letter of 22 May 2008 stating:

"The evidence presented to me from the witnesses present does indicate that the officer did make comments that were inappropriate. Particularly there is reference to a breach of the peace allegation where the threat or words used must be 'life threatening'. In your own letter you also advise that your understanding of the description of a breach of the peace is that such a charge could relate to any conduct which causes alarm and/or annoyance.

Firstly may I confirm that your understanding of the description of a breach of the peace is, so far as I understand the definition, essentially accurate and there is not necessarily a need for any words used to be life threatening. The other remarks as outlined by the witnesses present at the time added little value to the enquiry being undertaken and in that regard were inappropriate and regrettable. You may be assured that the officer has been spoken to by a senior officer in respect of this matter.”

Consideration

Whilst Inspector G’s report does not specifically address this complaint, both Chief Inspector H and Superintendent J identify this as an area requiring a specific response.

However, Chief Inspector H’s response refers to the perceptions of witnesses and does little more than advise the applicant that he would inform Constable C of his disappointment with the content of Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F’s statements. It appears that Chief Inspector H may have taken into account Constable C’s denial of having made the comments alleged by Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F. In the Commissioner’s view, it does not appear that Chief Inspector H considered the statements of Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F as sufficient evidence to substantiate the applicant’s complaint.

However, Superintendent J’s response goes further in that he accepted the evidence provided in the statements of Mr A, Miss B, and Mrs F and effectively found the applicant’s complaint to be substantiated. Having agreed with the applicant that the comments made to Mr A were inappropriate, Superintendent J informed the applicant that Constable C had been spoken to by a senior officer. Superintendent J’s acceptance of the evidence contained in the statements of Mr A, Miss B and Mrs F is in accordance with Strathclyde Police’s complaint handling Standard Operating Procedures which states that evidence should be considered on the “balance of probability”.

Despite some initial flaws in the handling of this complaint Strathclyde Police has taken into account all relevant evidence and reached reasonable conclusions. Accordingly, the Commissioner considers that this was complaint was handled in a reasonable manner. No further action is required of Strathclyde Police in this connection.

Complaint 4: That no senior officers were made aware of Mr A’s arrest

The applicant is unhappy that no supervisory officers were informed of Mr A’s arrest. In reference to this complaint the applicant stated:

“How is it possible that no supervisory officers were made aware of the situation and what checks and balances were in place to ensure that all steps had been taken to prevent you mend [your men] being arrested on the whim of a malicious and spiteful liar.”

Internal Handling

This complaint was raised at a meeting between the applicant, Chief Inspector H and Deputy Divisional Commander J on 8 April 2008. The matter was discussed at that meeting and Superintendent J dealt with it in his letter to the applicant of 22 May 2008 in which he stated:

“You have asked why no supervisors were made aware of the situation and as I explained at the interview you have used rather emotive and direct terms in respect of a third party and I have no specific comment to make in respect of them. Nevertheless I do understand your concern with a regard to a supervisory officer being made aware of the situation. I am however equally confident that there was no specific need for supervisory intervention in the basic circumstances as known at that time.”

Consideration

The Commissioner notes that the police officers involved in the arrest were responding to an allegation which had been substantiated by witnesses to the incident. When requesting that Constables D and E arrest Mr A, Constable C was acting on the information provided by three witnesses.

There appears to be no doubt that the evidence was sufficient to arrest Mr A. Accordingly, in the Commissioner's view there was no need to clarify the correct course of action with a senior officer. Superintendent J's response that having a senior officer informed would not have resulted in a different course of action being taken was therefore reasonable.

In any event, the Commissioner notes from Mr A's custody record that his detention was reviewed by the duty officer and all was deemed to be in order. It therefore appears that the decision to continue Mr A's attention was reviewed by a senior officer.

In the Commissioner's view, this complaint was handled by Strathclyde Police in a reasonable manner. Accordingly, no further action is required of Strathclyde Police in this connection.

Complaint 5: The classification of the incident as a domestic one

During his meeting with Chief Inspector H on 8 April 2008, the applicant raised concerns that the incident leading to the arrest of Mr A was classed by the police as a domestic dispute. In particular, the applicant made the following comments:

"Why was it assumed that the incident was a 'domestic' dispute when the boy and girl did not share accommodation? In what way was their situation 'domestic'?"

Internal Handling

Superintendent J's letter of response of 22 May 2008 stated:

"You may recall during the course of our conversation that we explained that matter in detail. In essence the relationship between your son and one of the witnesses to the original incident was such that they were, by any general description, in fact involved in a personal relationship. Although the relationship had been terminated prior to the incident concerned, their original relationship was a crucial factor in the contact between them that day. The relationship therefore was a significant aspect of the incident concerned and in those circumstances we correctly identified the contact as having a domestic background."

Consideration

The incident was defined as "domestic" by Strathclyde Police because it concerned two individuals who had previously been involved in a relationship. The joint protocol on domestic abuse between the Association of Chief Police Officers for Scotland (ACPOS) and Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (COPFS) defines domestic abuse as:

"Any form of physical, sexual or mental and emotional abuse which might amount to criminal conduct and which takes place within the context of a close relationship. The relationship will be between partners (married, cohabiting or otherwise) or ex-partners. The abuse can be committed in the home or elsewhere."

Superintendent J informed the applicant that the nature of the relationship between Mr A and his former girlfriend was the reason for the incident being deemed as domestic. Given the terms of the above definition of domestic abuse, Superintendent J's response appears reasonable. As

such, the Commissioner is satisfied that Strathclyde Police has handled this complaint in a reasonable manner.

Complaint 6: Clarity and completeness of Strathclyde Police's responses

The Commissioner notes that the applicant was provided with two written responses from Strathclyde Police that addressed each of his complaints. Having reviewed the manner in which Strathclyde Police has handled each complaint, the Commissioner is satisfied that the responses from Strathclyde Police to the applicant are not only clear but also address each of the complaints raised.

The Commissioner notes that Superintendent J and Chief Inspector H met with the applicant to discuss his complaints after he received the first written response. However, there is no note of this meeting and therefore no auditable record of the discussions that took place. The Commissioner has already recommended that Strathclyde Police reminds all officers dealing with complaints to maintain accurate and auditable records of their enquiries. However, the Commissioner does not consider that the absence of such records affected the outcome of this complaint.

Conclusions, Recommendations and Learning

Complaint 1: That police officers refused to take a statement from a Miss B

In the Commissioner's view, Strathclyde Police handled this complaint in a reasonable manner. Accordingly, no further action is required in this connection.

Complaint 2: officers would not accept counter allegations from Mr A

In the Commissioner's view, Strathclyde Police handled this complaint in a reasonable manner. However, the Commissioner recommends that Strathclyde Police reminds all officers who deal with complaints of the importance of maintaining effective and auditable records of their investigations.

Complaint 3: Constable C made inappropriate remarks to Mr A

In the Commissioner's view, Strathclyde Police handled this complaint in a reasonable manner. Accordingly, no further action is required in this connection.

Complaint 4: That no senior officers were made aware of Mr A's arrest

In the Commissioner's view, Strathclyde Police handled this complaint in a reasonable manner. Accordingly, no further action is required in this connection.

Complaint 5: The classification of the incident as a domestic one

In the Commissioner's view, Strathclyde Police handled this complaint in a reasonable manner. Accordingly, no further action is required in this connection.

Complaint 6: Clarity and completeness of Strathclyde Police's responses

In the Commissioner's view, overall the responses issued to the applicant by Strathclyde Police were clear and addressed each of the points the applicant raised. Accordingly, no further action is required of Strathclyde Police in this connection.

John McNeill
Police Complaints Commissioner for Scotland

Hamilton House
Caird Park
Hamilton
ML3 0QA