

## FOI Disclosures May 2025

### Index

This month we have responded to questions relating to the following topics:

- [Investigation into the Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police](#)
- [IOPC oversight, integrity, impact of reforms and referral statistics](#)
- [IOPC Anti Corruption Unit](#)
- [Length of IOPC investigations](#)
- [IOPC Employee Expenses](#)
- [Appeals and excessive use of force](#)

If you require a full copy of any of the embedded attachments, please contact [Requestinfo@policeconduct.gov.uk](mailto:Requestinfo@policeconduct.gov.uk) quoting the reference number from the relevant response.

<b><u>Ref</u></b> <b><u>5025421</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>Investigation into the Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police</u></b>
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<p><i>"Further to the IOPC statement by Director of Operations Steve Noonan said: "We are investigating the conduct of the Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police (TVP), Jason Hogg, as part of an ongoing independent investigation....."</i></p> <p><i>Q1 Please provide the name of the other senior TVP officer under investigation and the name of the former senior TVP officer referred to in this announcement.</i></p> <p><i>Q2 Please explain why Surrey Police was selected by the IOPC over other police forces."</i></p>
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<p>Q1 We have decided that we are unable to release this information to you by virtue of an exemption provided at section 40(2) of the FOIA which relates to personal data.</p> <p>Q2 It is a matter for the Appropriate Authority , which in this case was the Thames Valley Police, and not the IOPC, to decide who conducts managed investigations. Therefore we do not hold any information relating to this part of your request.</p>
<b><u>Ref</u></b> <b><u>5025413</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>IOPC oversight, integrity, impact of reforms and referral statistics</u></b>
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<p>"</p>

*These questions relate directly to oversight, leadership integrity, and the actual impact of your stated reforms in relation to policing transparency and public trust. Questions Requiring Factual Clarification or Documented Evidence:*

- 1. How does the IOPC measure the success or failure of its own oversight model when the majority of serious misconduct (especially involving senior officers) is deferred to “local investigation”?*
- 2. In light of the IOPC Oversight Newsletter (Jan 2025) stating that inappropriate suspensions of complaints occurred due to lack of rationale, how many suspensions have been reversed or challenged by the IOPC in the past 12 months?*
- 3. Can the IOPC provide any published data showing measurable change in officer behaviour, community satisfaction, or complaint reductions as a result of the training mentioned in partnership with Northumbria Police?*
- 4. What percentage of complaints made against senior officers (including those involving sexual misconduct or abuse of power) have resulted in independent investigation by the IOPC, rather than internal referral?*
- 5. When a force labels a complaint “vexatious” or “repetitious” (as outlined in the 2022 Complaints Guide), what mechanisms exist to ensure that label is not used to dismiss valid systemic complaints?*
- 6. In relation to Operation Linden, the IOPC states senior officer misconduct was investigated. Can you confirm whether any individuals were formally disciplined, charged, or publicly named as a result of those investigations?*
- 7. Given the systemic nature of failings noted in multiple documents (NPCC Strategic Plan, Policing Vision 2025), what steps is the IOPC taking to publicly audit itself and publish success metrics showing improvement in complaint resolution times, transparency, or community trust?*

*Accountability-Triggering “Catch” Questions:*

- 8. Does the IOPC accept that sending the majority of complaints back to forces to investigate themselves undermines its own mandate of independent oversight?*
- 9. If the public continues to lose confidence in complaint systems, and police leadership fails to reform, what safeguards exist to prevent the IOPC from becoming an extension of institutional self-protection rather than public accountability?*
- 10. Does the IOPC agree that the absence of regular public audits and real-time accountability tracking leaves the system open to abuse, particularly where internal complaint handlers have existing relationships with accused officers?*

## **Response**

1. We have understood this as relating to the IOPC's general functions as defined in section 10, Police Reform Act 2002. We would refer you to the information published on the following pages of our website: [Our strategy and performance | Independent Office for Police Conduct \(IOPC\)](#)

[Public confidence and engagement | Independent Office for Police Conduct \(IOPC\)](#)

2. Please see the data in the 'suspended complaints' tab of the Excel file included with the email attaching this letter.

Tables showing number of Suspended Complaints received and completed between 01.04.24-01.04.25 and their outcomes

Received	49				
Completed	112				
Decision	Count				
Force directed to continue investigation	2				
Force's decision partially agreed with	5				
Force's decision to suspend agreed with	38				
No IOPC decision - force changed their opinion	2				
No IOPC decision - investigation already un-suspende	6				
(blank)	59				
<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>				

3. We do not hold this information. The work described in our Oversight January 2025 issue, while supported by the IOPC force bulletin data, was carried out by Northumbria Police.

4. For comprehensive data about complaints against chief officers we recommend that you contact the local policing body (the Police and Crime Commissioner or Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime) as the appropriate authority for complaints and recordable conduct matters that relate to their chief officers. This data is not reported to the IOPC.

Please see the 'referrals' tab of the Excel file included with the email attaching this letter. This confirms the number of referrals from PCCs received and decided by IOPC between 1 April 2024 and 1 April 2025 and their outcomes.

**Number of Referrals from PCCs received and completed between 01.04.24-01.04.25 and their outcomes**

Received	49
Completed	48
<b>MOI Decision</b>	<b>Count</b>
Independent	22
Return to Force	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>

5. The words 'vexatious' and 'repetitious' do not appear in the current legislation (Police Reform Act 2002 and Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2020). The word 'repetitious' appears in the [IOPC Statutory Guidance](#) in relation to the recording of conduct matters. These terms may be used by professional standards departments or local policing bodies when concluding that they need not take any further action on a complaint. These decisions would give rise to a right of review.

We can find no record of a '2022 Complaints Guide'.

6. For the Operation Linden investigation outcomes we would refer you to page 19 of the [Operation Linden Executive Summary](#).

The investigation of a complaint relating to senior leadership did not result in formal disciplinary action against any officer. The IOPC's findings on this complaint are on pages 112-113 of the [Overarching report](#).

We would also refer you to these IOPC statements containing information relevant to this part of your request:

[Rotherham child sexual abuse investigation extends to former senior command team | Independent Office for Police Conduct \(IOPC\)](#)

[Statement following misconduct hearing linked to Operation Linden | Independent Office for Police Conduct \(IOPC\)](#)

7. We would refer you to the sources sign-posted under part 1 above and, in particular, the information regarding public confidence and engagement.

We also publish our [stakeholder research report](#) each year, which contains information about stakeholders' confidence in IOPC and other key metrics around perceived independence and impact.

Questions 8,9,10. We do not hold information in answer to these questions. As you may know, the general right of access under FOIA applies only to recorded information which is held by the public authority at the time that it receives the request. It follows that a public authority is not required to retrieve or create any information it does not already hold and there is no

	obligation to answer questions generally, express an opinion or enter into a discussion or debate.
<b><u>Ref</u></b> <b><u>5025419</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>IOPC Anti Corruption Unit</u></b>
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<p><i>Please disclose by way of the Freedom of Information Act, 2000 the following data:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The date the IOPC ACU was formed.</i></li> <li><i>2. Its stated aims and objectives.</i></li> <li> <i>a. The number of IOPC officers deployed within it.</i>   <i>b. The number of non-IOPC operatives deployed within it (for example, police detectives on secondment).</i> </li> <li><i>4. To whom does the IOPC ACU department head report within the IOPC (job title will suffice).</i></li> <li> <i>5. The number of investigations with which it has been involved since its formation.</i> </li> </ol>
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Anti-Corruption Unit in its current establishment was formed in November 2017</li> <li>The Anti-Corruption Unit provides oversight, direction, and control of investigations into serious corruption within police forces and law enforcement bodies for which the IOPC has statutory oversight.</li> <li> a. There is one Operations Manager/Statutory decision maker, two Operations Team Leaders and seven Lead Investigators.   b. None. The unit is entirely staffed by IOPC staff members. </li> <li>Deputy Director General.</li> <li>The unit currently receives an average of 120 referrals of serious corruption per year and is involved in the mode of investigation decisions of those referrals.</li> </ol>
<b><u>Ref</u></b> <b><u>5025422</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>Length of IOPC investigations</u></b>
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<p><i>"I'm seeking to ascertain the following about your organisation.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. How many investigations does your department hold greater than 3 years from the time of reporting.</i></li> </ol>

	<p>2. How many investigations does your department hold, and how long have each of those enquiries been going on for?</p> <p>3. On average how long does your department hold investigations until they are finalised.”</p>																																										
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<p>You should be aware that this information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data and statistics. Investigations reporting and statistics only count lead cases.</p> <p>1. The following figures represent an active count of independent investigations that have been open for longer than three years. We have separated core and major investigations- major investigations often take longer due to their size, complexity and sensitivity. At the time of the request there are 7 core investigations and 4 major investigations that have been open for longer than three years.</p> <p>2. Below we have provided an active count of current independent investigations split into six month age bands and an average duration of active cases.</p> <table><tr><th>Investigation age band</th><th>Core</th><th>Major Investigations</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>0-6m</td><td>116</td><td>2</td><td>118</td></tr><tr><td>6-12m</td><td>68</td><td>5</td><td>73</td></tr><tr><td>12-18m</td><td>33</td><td>4</td><td>37</td></tr><tr><td>18-24m</td><td>9</td><td>5</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>24m-30m</td><td>4</td><td>0</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>30-36m</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>36m+</td><td>7</td><td>4</td><td>11</td></tr><tr><td><b>Total</b></td><td><b>240</b></td><td><b>21</b></td><td><b>261</b></td></tr></table> <p><b>Average active durations</b></p> <table><tr><th>Core</th><th>Major Investigations</th><th>Average</th></tr><tr><td>174</td><td>429</td><td>194</td></tr></table> <p>3. Below we have provided a breakdown of average durations of investigations <b>completed</b> in the last three financial years and the average durations of investigations <b>closed</b> in the last three financial years year. An independent investigation is counted as <b>completed on the date when the final report is approved</b>. An investigation is counted as closed when all associated proceedings have concluded.</p>	Investigation age band	Core	Major Investigations	Total	0-6m	116	2	118	6-12m	68	5	73	12-18m	33	4	37	18-24m	9	5	14	24m-30m	4	0	4	30-36m	3	1	4	36m+	7	4	11	<b>Total</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>261</b>	Core	Major Investigations	Average	174	429	194
Investigation age band	Core	Major Investigations	Total																																								
0-6m	116	2	118																																								
6-12m	68	5	73																																								
12-18m	33	4	37																																								
18-24m	9	5	14																																								
24m-30m	4	0	4																																								
30-36m	3	1	4																																								
36m+	7	4	11																																								
<b>Total</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>261</b>																																								
Core	Major Investigations	Average																																									
174	429	194																																									

	<div>Average duration, completed in last 3 years</div> <table><thead><tr><th colspan="4">Major</th></tr><tr><th>Financial year</th><th>Core</th><th>Investigations</th><th>Average</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2022/23</td><td>184</td><td>423</td><td>191</td></tr><tr><td>2023/24</td><td>211</td><td>355</td><td>214</td></tr><tr><td>2024/25</td><td>221</td><td>2038</td><td>229</td></tr><tr><td>Average</td><td>205</td><td>530</td><td>210</td></tr></tbody></table> <div>Full average duration, closed in the last 3 years</div> <table><thead><tr><th colspan="4">Major</th></tr><tr><th>Financial year</th><th>Core</th><th>Investigations</th><th>Average</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2022/23</td><td>482</td><td>794</td><td>489</td></tr><tr><td>2023/24</td><td>496</td><td>739</td><td>499</td></tr><tr><td>2024/25</td><td>514</td><td>634</td><td>515</td></tr><tr><td>Average</td><td>495</td><td>765</td><td>499</td></tr></tbody></table>	Major				Financial year	Core	Investigations	Average	2022/23	184	423	191	2023/24	211	355	214	2024/25	221	2038	229	Average	205	530	210	Major				Financial year	Core	Investigations	Average	2022/23	482	794	489	2023/24	496	739	499	2024/25	514	634	515	Average	495	765	499
Major																																																	
Financial year	Core	Investigations	Average																																														
2022/23	184	423	191																																														
2023/24	211	355	214																																														
2024/25	221	2038	229																																														
Average	205	530	210																																														
Major																																																	
Financial year	Core	Investigations	Average																																														
2022/23	482	794	489																																														
2023/24	496	739	499																																														
2024/25	514	634	515																																														
Average	495	765	499																																														
<div>Ref</div> <div>5025423</div> <div>Back to top</div>	<div>IOPC Employee Expenses</div>																																																
<div>Request</div>	<div><p>"This is an information request relating to staff expenses over £500.</p><p>Please include the following information for the last four financial years, 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24:</p><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The total amount claimed in expenses by senior staff annually.</li><li>A breakdown of expenses by category (e.g., travel, accommodation, meals, hospitality, subsistence, training, etc.).</li><li>The total amount claimed by the most expensive individual claimant (job title only) in each of those years.</li><li>If available, a breakdown of expenses for members of the senior leadership team (e.g., Chief Executive, Directors), including job titles and total expenses per individual per year."</li></ul></div>																																																
<div>Response</div>	<div><p>We publish Directors' expenses on our website annually and this includes expenses for more senior positions of Director General and Deputy Director General.</p><p>The latest report is for 2023/24 and can be found on our website here: <a href="#">Directors' expenses for 23/24   Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</a></p><p>Reports for previous years covering the full period of the request are also available here:</p><p><a href="#">Directors' expenses for 22/23   Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</a></p><p><a href="#">Directors' expenses for 21/22   Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</a></p><p>The expenses are broken down by categories of travel, accommodation and subsistence and by individual job title and are itemised to show highest individual expense claim or the year.</p></div>																																																

Ref 5025432 <a href="#">Back to top</a>	Appeals and excessive use of force																																						
Request	<p>“The information I am requesting relates to appeals from police complaints and complaints relating to excessive use of force.</p> <p>1. Out of all the appeals submitted to the IOPC so far this year (2025), how many appeals were upheld and how many complaints were not upheld?</p> <p>2. Does the IOPC employ ex police officers to investigate appeals from police complaints?</p> <p>3. How many complaints did the IOPC receive for excessive use of handcuffs during stop and searches in 2024 and how many of those complaints were upheld?</p> <p>4. How many complaints did the IOPC receive for excessive use of force in 2024 and how many of those complaints were upheld?”</p>																																						
Response	<p>1. Rights of appeal were replaced with a single right of review under changes to the police complaints legislation that came into effect in 2020.</p> <p>The IOPC completed 887 valid reviews in the period from 1 January 2025 to 30 April 2025, of which 228 were upheld (26%), 659 not upheld (74%).</p> <p>2. Yes, our <a href="#">most recently published staff diversity data</a> includes the following:</p> <table><tr><th>Directorate</th><th>Total Staff</th><th>Ex police officer*</th><th>%</th><th>Ex police civilian*</th><th>%</th><th>Ex Police Both</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>Operations</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Casework</td><td>111</td><td>5</td><td>4.5%</td><td>10</td><td>9.0%</td><td>2</td><td>1.8%</td></tr></table> <p>3. Complaints are recorded by the respective police forces who provide data to the IOPC about the number and type of complaints made and how these complaints were subsequently dealt with, including demographic data about who complained and who the complaint was about. We publish this data in our <a href="#">Police complaints statistics report</a>.</p> <p>Please see our <a href="#">Guidance on capturing data about police complaints</a> for the categories and data standards used by police when recording and reporting on police complaints. These do not include a specific sub-category for handcuffs.</p> <p>The table below gives the outcomes of allegations <i>finalised</i> in 2024 with an allegation subcategory of ‘Stops and stop and search’ (a single subcategory) and a national complaint factor of ‘restraint equipment’.</p> <table><tr><th>Allegation Result Description</th><th>Finalised</th></tr><tr><td>No further action required</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Not able to determine if the service provided was acceptable</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>The service provided was acceptable</td><td>23</td></tr><tr><td>Not resolved - NFA</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Resolved</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>Grand Total</td><td>34</td></tr></table>	Directorate	Total Staff	Ex police officer*	%	Ex police civilian*	%	Ex Police Both	%	Operations								Casework	111	5	4.5%	10	9.0%	2	1.8%	Allegation Result Description	Finalised	No further action required	1	Not able to determine if the service provided was acceptable	1	The service provided was acceptable	23	Not resolved - NFA	2	Resolved	7	Grand Total	34
Directorate	Total Staff	Ex police officer*	%	Ex police civilian*	%	Ex Police Both	%																																
Operations																																							
Casework	111	5	4.5%	10	9.0%	2	1.8%																																
Allegation Result Description	Finalised																																						
No further action required	1																																						
Not able to determine if the service provided was acceptable	1																																						
The service provided was acceptable	23																																						
Not resolved - NFA	2																																						
Resolved	7																																						
Grand Total	34																																						



4. The table below contains data on the outcomes of allegations *finalised* in 2024 with the sub-category 'use of force'.

Allegation Result Description	Finalised
Case to answer	87
No case to answer	198
No further action required	335
Not able to determine if the service provided was	382
Regulation 41 applies	109
The service provided was acceptable	5464
The service provided was not acceptable	236
Unknown	1
Withdrawn	248
Not resolved - NFA	208
Resolved	1329
Grand Total	8597

In reference to the above data table, allegations with the result 'Not Resolved' and 'Resolved' were handled outside Schedule 3, Police Reform Act 2002 and the remainder under Schedule 3.

Please note that the data provided above relates to allegations *finalised* in 2024. It does not therefore include allegations recorded in this period that were not finalised and may include some allegations that were recorded before 1 January 2024.