

FOI Disclosures September 2025

Index

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

- [IOPC referrals for police pursuits, emergency responses and road traffic accidents](#)
- [IOPC exceptional circumstances for notification of a complaint to an appropriate authority](#)
- [Regulation 40 and PACE Code G guidance and compliance](#)
- [DSI referrals returned to originating force](#)
- [IOPC use of call in power](#)
- [IOPC voluntary referrals](#)
- [IOPC case referral statistics](#)
- [Yonder Public Perceptions Tracker surveys](#)

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

<u>Ref</u> <u>5025650</u> <small>Back to top</small>	<u>IOPC referrals for police pursuits, emergency responses and road traffic accidents</u>
<u>Request</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A force breakdown of the number of IOPC referrals received since April 2024 for serious injuries involving police pursuits and serious injuries involving emergency responses• A force breakdown of referrals involving deaths following police pursuits and, also emergency response pursuits for the last 10 years.
<u>Response</u>	In relation to serious injuries we have provided two tables of data. The first table shows the force breakdown of referrals where the case factors Road Traffic Incident/ Pursuit and Injury / Serious Injury have been applied. The second table provides a force breakdown of referrals received where the case factors Road Traffic Incident / Emergency Response / Injury / Serious Injury have been applied. It is important that you consider the data provided in these tables in conjunction with the following notes and caveats, with particular emphasis on the caveats relating to the application of case factors.

Caveats & Notes

Data is for illustrative purposes only

This data considers overt referrals only

The following data is based on Referrals received by the IOPC in the period 01.04.24 to 31.07.25 (inclusive)

This information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.

The appropriate authority, as well as other case attributes, is dependent on accurate data recording in the IOPC case management system by operational teams.

The case factors used in this data are 'Road Traffic Incident: Pursuit', 'Road Traffic Incident: Emergency Response' and 'Injury: Serious Physical Injury'

Please note that case factors are manually selected by operational staff to help identify the nature of the circumstances of a case. Therefore, they should not be relied on to provide definitive data since application of case factors is reliant on individual discretion

A factor selected on a case may be relevant to the incident to which the case relates but may not be what the case is about. Therefore data presented using case factors should be used for illustrative purposes only.

Please note that case factors are manually selected by operational staff to help identify the nature of the circumstances of a case. Therefore, the data pulled will represent all cases in which the Road Traffic Incident: Pursuit, Emergency Response and Injury: Serious Physical Injury factors were applied BUT there has not been a quality assessment completed to validate its accuracy or that all cases that should have had these factors applied have done so.

Data provided should not be relied on to provide definitive data as the application of case factors is reliant on individual discretion.

Table showing the Number of Referrals with the Road Traffic Incident: Pursuit and Injury: Serious Injury factors broken down by force

Table showing the Number of Referrals with the Road Traffic Incident: Pursuit and Injury: Serious Injury factors broken down by force

Force	No. Received
Avon & Somerset Constabulary	13
Bedfordshire Police	2
British Transport Police	1
Cheshire Constabulary	2
Cleveland Police	3
Cumbria Constabulary	1
Derbyshire Constabulary	3
Devon & Cornwall Police	3
Dorset Police	2
Durham Constabulary	5
Dyfed-Powys Police	1
Essex Police	6
Gloucestershire Constabulary	3
Greater Manchester Police	15
Gwent Police	2
Hampshire Constabulary	7
Hertfordshire Constabulary	1
Humberside Police	6
Kent Police	5
Lancashire Constabulary	5
Leicestershire Police	3
Lincolnshire Police	3
Merseyside Police	9
Metropolitan Police Service	58
Norfolk Constabulary	3
North Yorkshire Police	1
Northamptonshire Police	5
Northumbria Police	5
Nottinghamshire Police	6
South Wales Police	4
South Yorkshire Police	8
Staffordshire Police	3
Suffolk Constabulary	1
Surrey Police	3
Sussex Police	4
Thames Valley Police	6
Warwickshire Police	1
West Mercia Police	1
West Midlands Police	25
West Yorkshire Police	10
Wiltshire Police	3
TOTAL	248

Table showing the Number of Referrals with the Road Traffic Incident: Emergency Response and Injury: Serious Injury factors broken down by force

Force	No. Received
Avon & Somerset Constabulary	2
British Transport Police	2
Cambridgeshire Constabulary	1
Cleveland Police	1
Derbyshire Constabulary	1
Dorset Police	1
Durham Constabulary	2
Essex Police	1
Greater Manchester Police	3
Humberside Police	1
Lincolnshire Police	1
Metropolitan Police Service	1
Norfolk Constabulary	1
Northamptonshire Police	1
South Yorkshire Police	1
Surrey Police	1
West Midlands Police	3
West Yorkshire Police	3
TOTAL	27

In relation to your enquiry regarding the number of deaths we have provided data covering road traffic fatalities that occurred between 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2025. Road traffic fatalities include deaths of motorists, cyclists or pedestrians arising from police pursuits, police vehicles responding to emergency calls, and other police traffic-related activity. This does not include deaths following a road traffic incident (RTI) where the police attended immediately after the event as an emergency service.

This information is attached to this letter. We would direct you to the front cover of this document for explanations of the data provided.

Road traffic fatalities

The data used for this request covers road traffic fatalities that occurred between 2015/16 and 2024/25. We record the financial year within which the date of death occurred. The data included in this dataset is taken from deaths that occurred from 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2025. We have not considered more recent deaths as these cases are still in the process of being verified and checked.

Road traffic fatalities include deaths of motorists, cyclists or pedestrians arising from police pursuits, police vehicles responding to emergency calls, and other police traffic-related activity. This does not include deaths following a road traffic incident (RTI) where the police attended immediately after the event as an emergency service.

Pursuit related:

Incidents are classified as 'pursuit-related' if they involved a pursuit, or situations where officers have begun to follow a suspect vehicle. Not all these incidents will have entered an official pursuit phase as defined in the Authorised Professional Practice (APP) on police pursuits. (See College of Policing (2015) Authorised Professional Practice on police pursuits, 1) Incidents where there was a collision involving a vehicle that was recently pursued by the police, but where the police had lost sight of the vehicle, are included. Incidents where the police were driving in the direction of a vehicle before obtaining permission to pursue are also included as pursuit-related.

Emergency response-related:

This category includes all incidents that involve a police vehicle responding to a request for emergency assistance.

Other police traffic activity:

This category includes RTIs that did not happen during pursuit-related activity or an emergency response, but where incidents occur during standard police patrol or where drivers respond to seeing a police vehicle by fleeing the location and crashing (and there is no pursuit of the vehicle by police).

Please note Some incidents may involve multiple forces. Where this occurs, the relevant information has been recorded in the annotations beneath the table. The data provided refers to the number of fatalities, as opposed to the number of incidents. An incident may involve more than one fatality.

Road traffic fatalities that occurred between 2015/16 and 2024/25, by appropriate authority and RTI type

Appropriate authority	Financial year																		Total fatalities												
	2015/16			2016/17			2017/18			2018/19			2019/20			2020/21				2021/22			2022/23			2023/24			2024/25		
	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other		Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other	Fatal road	RTI road	RTI other
Avon & Somerset	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bedfordshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cambridgeshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cheshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cumbria	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Derbyshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Devon & Cornwall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Doncaster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Durham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Essex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Gloucestershire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Greater Manchester	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Hertfordshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Humber	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Leicestershire	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Lincolnshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
London	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Merseyside	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Metropolitan	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
North	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
North Wales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
North Yorkshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Northamptonshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nottinghamshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nottinghamshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Northumbria	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nottinghamshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
South Wales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
South Yorkshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Staffordshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Surrey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sussex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Thames Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
West Midlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
West Sussex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
West Yorkshire	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
West Yorkshire	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wiltshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total fatalities	13	2	0	205	0	4	17	8	4	30	0	7	19	3	2	20	1	4	34	3	30	2	6	34	1	7	19	8	3	289	

* For this fatality, Durham Police are also under investigation.
 ** For one of these fatalities, Staffordshire Police are also under investigation.
 *** For one of these fatalities, Hampshire Constabulary are also under investigation.
 § For this fatality, Oxford Police are also under investigation.

Ref
5025754
[Back to top](#)

IOPC exceptional circumstances for notification of a complaint to an appropriate authority

Request

"The Police Reform Act 2002, Schedule 3, paragraph 2(1) and (1A) state

'2 (1) Where a complaint is made to the Director General, the Director General shall give notification of the complaint to the appropriate authority.

(1A) But the Director General need not give that notification if the Director General considers that there are exceptional circumstances that justify its not being given.'

Please provide a copy of all of the information which is held by the IOPC about the above 'exceptional circumstances' which could have been applied to a complaint made to the IOPC from 01/01/2025 to the date of this FOI request.

If there was any variation in what were considered by the IOPC to be 'exceptional circumstances' during this time period then please provide this information."

Response

Our guidance to staff concerning the handling of direct complaints includes the following guidance:

	<div data-bbox="427 197 1168 224" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>Direct Complaints Guidance (following the introduction of the 2020 Regulations)</p> </div> <div data-bbox="427 237 673 259" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>Exceptional circumstances</p> </div> <div data-bbox="427 280 1152 329" data-label="Text"> <p>In certain exceptional circumstances, we do not have to forward a complaint to the AA. There are two broad categories for exceptional circumstances:</p> </div> <div data-bbox="456 349 1160 468" data-label="List-Group"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where notification of the complaint is likely to lead to a real risk that the complainant or any other person may suffer serious physical harm or loss of life • Where the notification is likely to lead to a real risk of prejudice to the interests of national security. </div> <div data-bbox="427 515 984 537" data-label="Text"> <p>In all cases of exceptional circumstances there is a two-stage test:</p> </div> <div data-bbox="456 560 1155 705" data-label="List-Group"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The risk must be real. This means that it would not be sufficient for the complainant to refer to exceptional circumstances without some description of why and how the complainant believes the exceptional circumstance may be genuine. 2. Does the risk of forwarding the complaint outweigh the benefits of passing it on? </div> <div data-bbox="427 723 1110 775" data-label="Text"> <p>There will not be many cases, if any, where the risks of exceptional circumstances outweigh the benefits of forwarding the complaint.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="427 795 533 817" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>Case study</p> </div> <div data-bbox="427 837 1158 994" data-label="Text"> <p><i>A member of the public wishes to make a complaint that the head of the domestic violence unit in her police force has failed to investigate allegations she has made about her husband because they are old friends. She is also aware that the head of PSD is friends with her husband personally and her husband has warned her that any complaint would be covered up and that he would be informed that she had made one.</i></p> </div> <div data-bbox="427 1014 1155 1093" data-label="Text"> <p><i>In this circumstance there is a real risk that forwarding the complaint to the AA could result in the complainant sustaining physical harm. The Advisor should seek advice from their line manager.</i></p> </div> <div data-bbox="427 1113 1160 1187" data-label="Text"> <p>In practice, therefore, our staff will assess the complaint document against the criteria listed above. It may be that contact will need to be made with the complainant or others to gather further information.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="427 1187 1117 1261" data-label="Text"> <p>If the person dealing with the complaint believes that they have such a case they should discuss the complaint with their line manager, who will escalate the matter further if required.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="408 1272 1324 1308" data-label="Text"> <p>There have been no variations in this guidance since 1 January 2025.</p> </div>
<div data-bbox="228 1312 376 1415" data-label="Text"> <p>Ref 5025759 Back to top</p> </div>	<div data-bbox="427 1312 1487 1350" data-label="Section-Header"> <p><u>Regulation 40 and PACE Code G guidance and compliance</u></p> </div>
<div data-bbox="228 1424 376 1462" data-label="Section-Header"> <p><u>Request</u></p> </div>	<div data-bbox="411 1424 936 1456" data-label="Text"> <p><i>I am seeking disclosure of the following:</i></p> </div> <div data-bbox="411 1489 1495 1933" data-label="List-Group"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Internal guidance, policies, or instructions used by the IOPC in assessing whether police forces have complied with the requirements of:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Regulation 40 of the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2020 (complaint suspension), and</i> • <i>PACE Code G, paragraph 2.9(e) (“necessity test” for arrest, specifically reliance on “prompt and effective investigation”).</i> 2. <i>Any training materials, briefings, or written criteria provided to IOPC staff for evaluating whether:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A Regulation 40 suspension notice demonstrates case-specific reasoning, as opposed to generic or boilerplate wording.</i> • <i>Police reliance on “prompt and effective investigation” under PACE Code G is considered sufficient only when supported by case-specific facts.</i> </div>

	<p><i>3.Any records, audits, or evaluations in which the IOPC has considered whether police forces are relying on standardised or boilerplate reasoning (rather than individualised justification) when applying Regulation 40 or PACE Code G. If possible, please provide documents created or in use from 1 January 2020 to the present.”</i></p>
<u>Response</u>	<p>Our response is as follows.</p> <p>1.Please find below containing the information we hold under this part of your request. This is an excerpt from our operational guidance to staff. We have carried out automated key word searches and made enquiries with members of our staff with involvement in these matters and can confirm that we do not hold further information.</p> <p>Operational guidance re suspended complaints</p> <p><u>When would it be appropriate for an AA to suspend the investigation for this reason?</u></p> <p>The power to suspend only arises where continuing the investigation or other procedure would prejudice a criminal investigation or criminal proceedings. There should be specific, identified prejudice (and this prejudice should also be significant).</p> <p>To determine whether such prejudice arises, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the matter raises issues which are the same as, or closely connected with, the issues in the ongoing criminal investigation or proceedings; and • What particular prejudice (if any) would be caused to the ongoing criminal investigation or proceedings by the investigation. <p>It is best practice to ask the AA to explain how, if the investigation or other procedure continued, that would prejudice the criminal investigation or proceedings. The AA should justify how the significance is not outweighed by the public interest in ensuring the prompt investigation of the complaint and, where justified, the prompt bringing of criminal or disciplinary proceedings against the police staff concerned. This is the public interest consideration.</p> <p>It is a balancing exercise. Consideration should be given to factors such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relative seriousness of the allegations (against the police officer/s and the criminal allegation against the suspect/defendant in the criminal proceedings) • The relative strength of the evidence in support of each allegation, further information should be sought where this is not clear. • Likely length of the delay – and whether this would hamper any potential proceedings (criminal or disciplinary) against the police officer/s. In particular, consider whether suspending the complaint investigation would risk the expiration of the six-month statutory time limit for prosecuting summary only offences • Whether the delay would otherwise lead to injustice to the complainant or to the subject of the complaint. <p>It is not enough for an AA to merely say that it is delaying dealing with the complaint because the issues are the same or closely linked to those in the criminal proceedings – the AA should provide its rationale to demonstrate it has considered the public interest – in other words, that the balancing exercise has been properly carried out.</p>

It may be appropriate to continue investigating the complaint even though the issues raised by the criminal investigation and the complaint are closely linked. For example, where it is alleged that the police officer has committed a more serious offence than that with which the defendant in the related criminal proceedings is charged. Particularly if there is evidence to support the truth of that allegation. It might then be in the public interest to prioritise the investigation and prosecution of the more serious offence despite the risk of prejudice to the ongoing prosecution of the lesser offence.

Internal process

The Casework Admin Hub will ensure we have the **AA's rationale** for the decision to suspend dealing with the complaint before the application is marked as being ready on the allocation spreadsheet. In most cases, this should be in **addition** to the AA's decision letter to the complainant.

As outlined above, the rationale needs to be sufficiently detailed to show why the matters are the same or so closely linked that prejudice is likely to arise and that the balancing exercise has been properly conducted.

Things to look out for:

- AA automatically suspends dealing with a complaint because it concerns similar issues as the criminal prosecution (usually of the complainant) without considering the public interest aspect / undertaking the balancing exercise. Or
 - without properly considering the specifics of the complaint. It might be possible to deal with the complaint without potentially prejudicing the ongoing criminal proceedings if the issues are not the same/closely linked.
- Has the AA done what it can to ensure that evidence is secured even though the investigation is suspended? For example, securing CCTV footage that might otherwise be lost, obtaining witness statements from those not involved in the ongoing criminal proceedings, service of Reg notices etc.
- Has the AA sought the view of the CPS or their own legal department before exercising their suspension power? This is not always necessary because in many instances, the matters raised in the complaint are matters that **must** be determined by the court (because they go directly to admissibility of evidence or to the defence to the criminal allegation). However, we would expect the AA to seek the view of the CPS or their own legal department where things are not so clear.
- Has the AA considered any other measures to minimise the risk of prejudice to the criminal proceedings while still allowing the investigation to proceed? This would require the prior agreement of the CPS.
- When asked to provide a more detailed rationale, the AA might review the appropriateness of its decision and decide to investigate the complaint (or some parts of it) without the need for us to do anything formally. We might not agree (because we feel that there would be prejudice etc) but we have no remit to direct them **not** to deal with a complaint.

Once you have reviewed all the relevant information, you need to make a **provisional decision** as to whether the AA's decision to suspend dealing with the complaint is appropriate. If you don't agree with the decision of the AA, remember the requirement that we **consult** with the AA before making a direction. You must get their views before proceeding even if they have fully explained their decision.

The regulations do not require either us or the AA to obtain CPS views, but it may be necessary to seek these in order to decide whether prejudice would result or if other measures to mitigate the risk of prejudice are acceptable to the CPS.

Your provisional decision needs to go to an **Ops Manager** for approval.

You can either complete the suspended investigation minute (found in the related documents section of this page) or, if your decision letter to the complainant is detailed enough, you can send a copy of this with a covering email to an Ops Manager.

You need to provide the Ops Manager with enough information and rationale to allow them to review your provisional decision without them needing to go through all the BGPs and complainant representations.

The decision letter should be sent on behalf of the Ops Manager. Please ensure that all relevant documents are added to CMS with the correct title.

Examples:

- A person is arrested for theft and complains about the treatment received in the custody suite. The complaint will not impinge on the theft trial. Continuing the investigation of the complaint would not prejudice the trial, so there is no power to suspend the investigation.
- A person is arrested for possession of indecent photographs of children and a large amount of property (computers, phones, media etc) is seized for forensic examination. The complainant runs a business and some of the seized equipment is needed for this purpose. He complains about the length of time that it is being retained and asks for some of his equipment to be returned to him. Continuing the investigation of the complaint to establish whether or not the continued retention of all the property is legitimate would not prejudice the trial (because it does not relate to the admissibility of the evidence), so there is no power to suspend the investigation.
- A person is charged with assaulting a police officer who was arresting her. The complaint includes an allegation that the arrest was unlawful. The legitimacy of the arrest goes directly to the criminal proceedings (because the offence requires that the police officer was acting in the execution of their duty). The same issues arise in both the complaint and criminal proceedings and there is likely to be prejudice to the criminal trial. The power to suspend would arise.
- A person is arrested and charged following the execution of a search warrant at her home. Property is found during the search that was not the object of the warrant and did not relate to the original suspect. She complains about the legitimacy of the search, the scope of it and seizure of property that was not listed on the original warrant. Her complaint goes directly to the admissibility of the primary evidence against her in the criminal proceedings and there is likely to be prejudice to the criminal trial if the complaint investigation was to proceed. The power to suspend would arise.

2. Having carried out automated key word searches and made enquiries with members of our staff with involvement in these matters, we can confirm that we do not hold information within the specific terms of this part of your request.

3. We would refer you to the January 2025 newsletter article as per the following document.

We can confirm that other than this newsletter article, having carried out all appropriate searches we do not hold information within the specific terms of this part of your request.

	<p>January 2025 newsletter article</p> <p>The power to suspend the investigation or other handling of a complaint Following the question last month about the power to suspend investigations or other handling of a complaint, we thought it worthwhile to send a reminder of when the power to suspend a complaint should be exercised. In the last few months, our Casework teams saw several cases which were suspended but no specific, identified prejudice was provided or rationale for why the prejudice would be significant to back up the reason for the complaint to be suspended. This has led us to direct the police force to continue the complaint handling.</p> <p>Chapter 15 of the IOPC Statutory Guidance gives a comprehensive overview of the considerations that should be made when suspending a complaint, including at paragraph 15.2 where it states there needs to be a specific, identified prejudice and that the prejudice should be significant. It states where continuing the investigation or other handling would, if it were to continue, prejudice any criminal or other proceedings. Our bold emphasis here on the word ‘would’ in conjunction with a specific, identified and significant prejudice highlights that this is a high threshold to reach. Even when this high threshold is met, the use of the power to suspend is still discretionary.</p> <p>Forces should consider getting the views of the CPS or their own legal department about whether continuing the investigation or handling would prejudice any criminal or other proceedings. Forces should also consider whether any steps short of suspension can be taken to mitigate the prejudice. The complaint handler should document the reason for the decision to suspend the complaint and inform the complainant of this reason. If the complainant makes representations to have the decision to suspend considered, please send the IOPC the detailed reasons for the suspension.</p>
<p>Ref 5025766 Back to top</p>	<p>DSI referrals returned to originating force</p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p><i>“Since 2015 (or a more recent date if looking back that far falls outside the cost constraints of the FOIA), what percentage of cases referred to the IOPC mandatorily because they involved deaths or serious injuries were referred back to the originating force? If possible can you please break the data down into smaller time periods, eg quarters?”</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>Please find attached the information you requested. There are two tables. The top table relates to all DSI referrals and the bottom table to mandatory DSI referrals only. Please refer to the caveats and notes before considering this data.</p>

	<div>Caveats & Notes</div> <div>This data considers overt referrals only</div> <div>The following data is based on DSI Referrals received by the IOPC with the MOI was return to force</div> <div>The following data is for the time period 01.04.2015 to31.08.25 (inclusive)</div> <div>This information is taken from live data on 15/09/2025 and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.</div> <div>This information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.</div> <div>DSI Referrals(Received)- Returned to Force Apr 2015 - Aug 2025</div> <table><tr><th>Year</th><th>FY 2015/16</th><th>FY 2016/17</th><th>FY 2017/18</th><th>FY 2018/19</th><th>FY 2019/20</th><th>FY 2020/21</th><th>FY 2021/22</th><th>FY 2022/23</th><th>FY 2023/24</th><th>FY 2024/25</th><th>FY 2025/26</th></tr><tr><td>Return to Force</td><td>542</td><td>402</td><td>330</td><td>674</td><td>864</td><td>1,113</td><td>1,556</td><td>1,584</td><td>1,765</td><td>2,342</td><td>1,133</td></tr><tr><td>Grand Total</td><td>1,618</td><td>1,690</td><td>1,792</td><td>2,162</td><td>2,549</td><td>2,619</td><td>2,947</td><td>2,967</td><td>3,438</td><td>3,657</td><td>1,668</td></tr><tr><td>Percentage</td><td>33.50</td><td>23.79</td><td>19.92</td><td>31.17</td><td>33.90</td><td>42.64</td><td>52.80</td><td>53.39</td><td>51.34</td><td>64.04</td><td>67.93</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th>Year</th><th>FY 2015/16</th><th>FY 2016/17</th><th>FY 2017/18</th><th>FY 2018/19</th><th>FY 2019/20</th><th>FY 2020/21</th><th>FY 2021/22</th><th>FY 2022/23</th><th>FY 2023/24</th><th>FY 2024/25</th><th>FY 2025/26</th></tr><tr><td>Return to Force(Mandatory)</td><td>464</td><td>395</td><td>338</td><td>674</td><td>864</td><td>1,112</td><td>1,556</td><td>1,584</td><td>1,763</td><td>2,340</td><td>1,133</td></tr><tr><td>Grand Total</td><td>1,441</td><td>1,679</td><td>1,695</td><td>2,161</td><td>2,547</td><td>2,608</td><td>2,946</td><td>2,964</td><td>3,434</td><td>3,652</td><td>1,667</td></tr><tr><td>Percentage</td><td>32.20</td><td>23.76</td><td>19.94</td><td>31.19</td><td>33.92</td><td>42.64</td><td>52.82</td><td>53.44</td><td>51.34</td><td>64.07</td><td>67.97</td></tr></table>	Year	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17	FY 2017/18	FY 2018/19	FY 2019/20	FY 2020/21	FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY 2025/26	Return to Force	542	402	330	674	864	1,113	1,556	1,584	1,765	2,342	1,133	Grand Total	1,618	1,690	1,792	2,162	2,549	2,619	2,947	2,967	3,438	3,657	1,668	Percentage	33.50	23.79	19.92	31.17	33.90	42.64	52.80	53.39	51.34	64.04	67.93	Year	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17	FY 2017/18	FY 2018/19	FY 2019/20	FY 2020/21	FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY 2025/26	Return to Force(Mandatory)	464	395	338	674	864	1,112	1,556	1,584	1,763	2,340	1,133	Grand Total	1,441	1,679	1,695	2,161	2,547	2,608	2,946	2,964	3,434	3,652	1,667	Percentage	32.20	23.76	19.94	31.19	33.92	42.64	52.82	53.44	51.34	64.07	67.97
Year	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17	FY 2017/18	FY 2018/19	FY 2019/20	FY 2020/21	FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY 2025/26																																																																																						
Return to Force	542	402	330	674	864	1,113	1,556	1,584	1,765	2,342	1,133																																																																																						
Grand Total	1,618	1,690	1,792	2,162	2,549	2,619	2,947	2,967	3,438	3,657	1,668																																																																																						
Percentage	33.50	23.79	19.92	31.17	33.90	42.64	52.80	53.39	51.34	64.04	67.93																																																																																						
Year	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17	FY 2017/18	FY 2018/19	FY 2019/20	FY 2020/21	FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY 2025/26																																																																																						
Return to Force(Mandatory)	464	395	338	674	864	1,112	1,556	1,584	1,763	2,340	1,133																																																																																						
Grand Total	1,441	1,679	1,695	2,161	2,547	2,608	2,946	2,964	3,434	3,652	1,667																																																																																						
Percentage	32.20	23.76	19.94	31.19	33.92	42.64	52.82	53.44	51.34	64.07	67.97																																																																																						
<div>Ref</div> <div>5025767</div> <div>Back to top</div>	<div>IOPC use of call in power</div>																																																																																																
<div>Request</div>	<div>For each month since January 2015 how many cases have been "called in" by the IOPC using the DG's power under Schedule 3, subpara 4(1)(c)?</div> <div>Please also provide data showing the outcomes of those cases, ie were they then referred back to the force, or ended in NFA, charge, or a misconduct hearing/meeting.</div> <div>Please provide the outcomes of the "called in" referral cases determined as IOPC investigations.</div>																																																																																																
<div>Response</div>	<div>Please find below an Excel workbook including a table of all referrals called in by the IOPC from 1 January 2015 and the IOPC's mode of investigation decisions on those referrals.</div> <div>As you may know, when the IOPC receives a referral it must first decide whether it is necessary for the matter to be investigated and, if one is necessary, we must apply a test of seriousness and public interest in deciding whether the investigation should take the form of an IOPC independent investigation, an IOPC directed investigation, or an investigation to be carried out by the police.</div> <div>Please note that there is no difference between 'called in' and 'called in by the IOPC' as both relate to the same type of referral.</div> <div>Whereas you have asked for referrals made under paragraph 4(1)(c), which relates only to complaints, the data we are providing relates to all referrals called in by the</div>																																																																																																

IOPC in this period, and thus includes conduct matters called in by the IOPC (paragraph 13(1)(c)) as well. This is in line with the referral data we publish in our force bulletins.

We hold data on the ultimate outcomes of any investigation that may have resulted from these referrals (for example, whether they resulted in any misconduct outcomes) only when the matter was determined as an IOPC investigation and was not later redetermined to an investigation carried out by the police. Therefore, we cannot provide outcomes data for these referrals other than in respect of our mode of investigation decisions.

We would draw your attention to the information on the 'caveats and notes' tab of the attached data table.

OFFICIAL SENSITIVE: Data For Internal Use Only

Permission for use other than requested must be sought from the Performance Team.

Caveats & Notes

Data is for illustrative purposes only.

This data considers overt referrals only

The following data is based on Called In Referrals received and completed by the IOPC in the period 01.01.15 to 07.09.25 (inclusive)

This information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.

The appropriate authority, as well as other case attributes, is dependent on accurate data recording in the IOPC case management system by operational teams.

Any identifiable information regarding cases such as case reference, case name, etc. should **NOT** be shared externally.

Table showing the number of 'called in' referrals by financial year quarter since 01.01.15

	Q4 2014/15	Q1 2015/16	Q2 2015/16	Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Q1 2016/17	Q2 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Q1 2017/18	Q2 2017/18	Q3 2017/18	Q4 2017/18	Q1 2018/19	Q2 2018/19	Q3 2018/19	Q4 2018/19	Total
Called in	8	3	5	8	2		1							1		1	1	31
Called in by IOPC	12	18	19	18	14	7	5	3	5	3	1	4				1		110
Grand Total	20	21	24	26	16	7	6	3	5	3	1	4		1		2	1	141

Table showing the number of different outcomes of the 'called in' referrals

	Q4 2014/15	Q1 2015/16	Q2 2015/16	Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Q1 2016/17	Q2 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Q1 2017/18	Q2 2017/18	Q3 2017/18	Q4 2017/18	Q1 2018/19	Q2 2018/19	Q3 2018/19	Q4 2018/19	Total
Independent	15	16	21	23	13	8	4	2	4	2	1	3		1		2	1	115
Invalid																		1
Local	2	3	2	3	1	1							1					13
Managed	3	1			1		1											6
Return to Force			1		1			1	1									4
Supervised							1											1
Blank		1																1
Total	20	21	24	26	16	7	6	3	5	3	1	4		1		2	1	141

We have checked the list of 115 "called in" referral cases against the outcomes information we have and unfortunately there is no outcome information available for them without carrying out exhaustive searches that would exceed the cost limit under section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act by a very significant margin.

We can only provide outcomes data for individual investigations or subsequent criminal or disciplinary proceedings completed in the period April 2022 to March 2024. While we have reported on investigation outcomes from April 2018, the data for the years up to March 2022 is only available as the aggregated figures in these outcomes reports and we cannot match individual cases against their outcomes other than in the financial years 22/23 and 23/24.

As the "called in" referral type does not exist under the legislation that came into effect from 1 February 2020, there have been very few investigations following on from this type of referral since then, which probably explains why none are included in the 22/23 and 23/24 outcomes data.

<u>Ref</u> <u>5025768</u> Back to top	<u>IOPC voluntary referrals</u>
<u>Request</u>	<p><i>“Since 2015 how many voluntary referrals, ie those made under PRA Schedule 3, subpara 4(2) and 4(3) has the IOPC received, broken down per quarter? What data do you hold on the outcomes of those referrals, ie referred back to the force, charge, NFA, or decision to hold a misconduct meeting/hearing?</i></p> <p><i>Please provide outcomes data for any of the 846 voluntary referrals determined as IOPC “independent” investigations during this period of over 10 years.”</i></p>
<u>Response</u>	<p>Please find below a table of all voluntary referrals received by the IOPC from 1 January 2015 and the IOPC’s mode of investigation decisions on those referrals.</p> <p>As you may know, when the IOPC receives a referral it must first decide whether it is necessary for the matter to be investigated and, if one is necessary, we must apply a test of seriousness and public interest in deciding whether the investigation should take the form of an IOPC independent investigation, an IOPC directed investigation, or an investigation to be carried out by the police. This is referred to as a mode of investigation (MOI) decision.</p> <p>Whereas you have asked for referrals made under paragraph 4(2) and (3), which relate only to complaints, the data we are providing relates to all voluntary referrals received during this period, and thus includes voluntary referrals of conduct matters (paragraph 13(2) and (3)) as well. This is in line with the referral data we publish in our force bulletins. If, however, you require that this data be separated according to complaints and conduct matters, this can be provided.</p> <p>We hold data on the ultimate outcomes of any investigation that may have resulted from these referrals (for example, whether they resulted in any misconduct outcomes) only when the matter was determined as an IOPC investigation and was not later redetermined to an investigation carried out by the police. Our investigations account for only a minority of the MOI decisions on these referrals. Therefore, we cannot provide outcomes data for these referrals other than in respect of our mode of investigations decisions.</p> <p>We would draw your attention to the advice and information in the 'notes and caveats' tab of the data table.</p>

OFFICIAL SENSITIVE: Data For Internal Use Only

Permission for use other than requested must be sought from the Performance Team.

Caveats & Notes

Data is for illustrative purposes only.

This data considers overt referrals only

The following data is based on Voluntary Referrals received and completed by the IOPC in the period 01.01.15 to 09.09.25 (inclusive)

This information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.

The appropriate authority, as well as other case attributes, is dependent on accurate data recording in the IOPC case management system by operational teams.

Table showing the number of Voluntary Referrals received per quarter since 01.01.15

Referral Type	Q4 FY 2014/15	Q1 FY 2015/16	Q2 FY 2015/16	Q3 FY 2015/16	Q4 FY 2015/16	Q1 FY 2016/17	Q2 FY 2016/17	Q3 FY 2016/17	Q4 FY 2016/17	Q1 FY 2017/18	Q2 FY 2017/18	Q3 FY 2017/18	Q4 FY 2017/18	Q1 FY 2018/19
Voluntary	183	168	137	114	128	93	81	81	81	82	49	62	58	58

Table showing the decisions of the Voluntary Referrals received per quarter since 01.01.15

Decision Type	Q4 FY 2014/15	Q1 FY 2015/16	Q2 FY 2015/16	Q3 FY 2015/16	Q4 FY 2015/16	Q1 FY 2016/17	Q2 FY 2016/17	Q3 FY 2016/17	Q4 FY 2016/17	Q1 FY 2017/18	Q2 FY 2017/18	Q3 FY 2017/18	Q4 FY 2017/18	Q1 FY 2018/19
(Blank)										1				
Directed														
Independent	30	32	25	33	50	38	29	21	28	28	23	18	15	24
Invalid										3	1	2	5	3
Local	101	76	80	60	55	42	48	47	45	43	23	34	36	26
Managed	24	12	4		5	1	1	2				3		1
Return to Force	26	45	27	21	15	11	3	11	7	5	2	3	2	1
Supervised	2	3	1		3	1			1	1	1	1	1	3
Grand Total	183	168	137	114	128	93	81	81	81	82	49	62	58	58

Q2 FY 2018/19	Q3 FY 2018/19	Q4 FY 2018/19	Q1 FY 2019/20	Q2 FY 2019/20	Q3 FY 2019/20	Q4 FY 2019/20	Q1 FY 2020/21	Q2 FY 2020/21	Q3 FY 2020/21	Q4 FY 2020/21	Q1 FY 2021/22	Q2 FY 2021/22	Q3 FY 2021/22	Q4 FY 2021/22
75	74	52	61	55	55	45	79	83	73	52	68	52	50	65

Q2 FY 2016/19	Q3 FY 2016/19	Q4 FY 2016/19	Q1 FY 2019/20	Q2 FY 2019/20	Q3 FY 2019/20	Q4 FY 2019/20	Q1 FY 2020/21	Q2 FY 2020/21	Q3 FY 2020/21	Q4 FY 2020/21	Q1 FY 2021/22	Q2 FY 2021/22	Q3 FY 2021/22	Q4 FY 2021/22
7			1	1	1			2	1					
18	16	13	22	12	18	15	28	26	18	21	21	12	8	19
3	4	3	1	3	3	1	3	1	1	4	2		2	2
48	40	29	34	34	27	25	44	47	45	23	43	40	38	38
1	1	1	2	5		1			1		1			
5	4	8	1		3	1	3	7	6	3	1		2	3
1				3	2	1			1					3
75	74	52	61	55	55	45	79	83	73	52	68	52	50	65

Q1 FY 2022/23	Q2 FY 2022/23	Q3 FY 2022/23	Q4 FY 2022/23	Q1 FY 2023/24	Q2 FY 2023/24	Q3 FY 2023/24	Q4 FY 2023/24	Q1 FY 2024/25	Q2 FY 2024/25	Q3 FY 2024/25	Q4 FY 2024/25	Q1 FY 2025/26	Q2 FY 2025/26	Grand Total
73	61	70	72	91	104	73	67	81	66	74	54	71	55	3326

Q1 FY 2022/23	Q2 FY 2022/23	Q3 FY 2022/23	Q4 FY 2022/23	Q1 FY 2023/24	Q2 FY 2023/24	Q3 FY 2023/24	Q4 FY 2023/24	Q1 FY 2024/25	Q2 FY 2024/25	Q3 FY 2024/25	Q4 FY 2024/25	Q1 FY 2025/26	Q2 FY 2025/26	Grand Total
4		1	1	2	2		1							9
16	11	11	4	16	15	13	16	22	18	11	11	10	9	846
1	2	2	3	4	1	2		3	3	1	1	1	2	73
51	45	51	57	66	82	52	47	52	44	45	34	52	29	1978
	2													67
1	1	5	5	2	3	4	3	2	3	11	6	7	5	282
			2											30
73	61	70	72	91	104	73	67	81	66	74	54	71	55	3326

We can only provide outcomes data for individual investigations or subsequent criminal or disciplinary proceedings completed in the period April 2022 to March 2024. The investigations outcomes data for these years in respect of these referrals is included below.

We would emphasise that misconduct and criminal outcomes are nearly always linked to matters referred to the IOPC under the mandatory referral criteria (other than Death or Serious Injury referrals) and so are much less likely to relate to a matter referred voluntarily. A single investigation may relate to several referrals based on different referral criteria and we would anticipate that most if not all of the outcomes listed below relate to investigations which were based on more than one referral. It should not be assumed, therefore, that the matter we received under the voluntary referral was the same matter that resulted in the investigation outcome we have reported.

Please also note the following when interpreting this data:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A single investigation may consider the conduct of multiple people.• There can be a significant time gap between the end of an IOPC investigation and the conclusion of any misconduct proceedings (led by the appropriate authority) or criminal cases (prosecuted by the Crown Prosecution Service).• Timeliness of post-investigation proceedings is not under IOPC direction. This is decided by the appropriate authority or the CPS. <p>Of the 613 independent investigations completed between 1/4/2022 and 31/3/2024, 7% (44) were related to Voluntary Referrals.</p> <p>Of these, 27% (12) had no conduct identified.</p> <p>For the remaining 32 cases, the outcomes of our investigations are below:</p> <table><tr><th>Row Labels</th><th>Cases</th><th>Cases %</th></tr><tr><td>CTA GM (case to answer – gross misconduct)</td><td>13</td><td>41%</td></tr><tr><td>CTA M (case to answer – misconduct)</td><td>11</td><td>34%</td></tr><tr><td>No CTA</td><td>13</td><td>41%</td></tr><tr><td>No CTA – Management Action</td><td>12</td><td>38%</td></tr><tr><td>Grand Total</td><td>32</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <p>The misconduct hearings which took place between 1/4/2022 and 31/3/2024, related to 140 investigations. Of these 17% (24) came from Voluntary Referrals.</p> <p>The outcomes of the misconduct hearings and the related sanctions are below:</p> <table><tr><th>Row Labels</th><th>Cases</th><th>Cases %</th></tr><tr><td>GM</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Dismissed without notice</td><td>9</td><td>38%</td></tr><tr><td>Final written warning</td><td>1</td><td>4%</td></tr><tr><td>N/A: Retired/Resigned</td><td>3</td><td>13%</td></tr><tr><td>M</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Final written warning</td><td>2</td><td>8%</td></tr><tr><td>Written warning</td><td>3</td><td>13%</td></tr><tr><td>No CTA</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>None</td><td>7</td><td>29%</td></tr><tr><td>Reflective Practice Review Process</td><td>2</td><td>8%</td></tr><tr><td>Grand Total</td><td>24</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <p>The criminal proceedings which concluded between 1/4/2022 and 31/3/2024, related to 38 investigations. Of these 5% (2) came from Voluntary Referrals.</p> <p>The outcomes of the criminal proceedings are below:</p> <table><tr><th>Row Labels</th><th>Cases</th><th>Cases %</th></tr><tr><td>Guilty</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Common Assault</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Community Sentence</td><td>1</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Guilty</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>Grand Total</td><td>2</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <p>In regard to your query about the difference between "local" and "return to force", the decisions that must be made by the IOPC when considering a referral are defined in Schedule 3 of the Police Reform Act.</p> <p>On receipt of a referral the IOPC must decide whether or not it is necessary for the matter to be investigated. When the IOPC decides that an investigation is not necessary and the matter is not already subject to an investigation by the appropriate authority (the police force or local policing body) the IOPC must refer the matter back to the appropriate authority to be handled in such reasonable and proportionate manner as the authority determines. The principles of reasonable and proportionate handling are discussed in Chapter 3 of our Statutory Guidance.</p> <p>When the IOPC decides that the matter should be investigated, one of the options available to the IOPC under the legislation is an investigation by the appropriate authority on its own behalf, also known as a 'local' investigation. For further information, please see page 67-68 of our Statutory Guidance: "Determining whether and how a matter should be investigated".</p> <p>The different modes of investigation are described in the glossary beginning on page 173 of the Statutory Guidance.</p>	Row Labels	Cases	Cases %	CTA GM (case to answer – gross misconduct)	13	41%	CTA M (case to answer – misconduct)	11	34%	No CTA	13	41%	No CTA – Management Action	12	38%	Grand Total	32	100%	Row Labels	Cases	Cases %	GM			Dismissed without notice	9	38%	Final written warning	1	4%	N/A: Retired/Resigned	3	13%	M			Final written warning	2	8%	Written warning	3	13%	No CTA			None	7	29%	Reflective Practice Review Process	2	8%	Grand Total	24	100%	Row Labels	Cases	Cases %	Guilty			Common Assault			Community Sentence	1	50%	Not Guilty				1	50%	Grand Total	2	100%
Row Labels	Cases	Cases %																																																																										
CTA GM (case to answer – gross misconduct)	13	41%																																																																										
CTA M (case to answer – misconduct)	11	34%																																																																										
No CTA	13	41%																																																																										
No CTA – Management Action	12	38%																																																																										
Grand Total	32	100%																																																																										
Row Labels	Cases	Cases %																																																																										
GM																																																																												
Dismissed without notice	9	38%																																																																										
Final written warning	1	4%																																																																										
N/A: Retired/Resigned	3	13%																																																																										
M																																																																												
Final written warning	2	8%																																																																										
Written warning	3	13%																																																																										
No CTA																																																																												
None	7	29%																																																																										
Reflective Practice Review Process	2	8%																																																																										
Grand Total	24	100%																																																																										
Row Labels	Cases	Cases %																																																																										
Guilty																																																																												
Common Assault																																																																												
Community Sentence	1	50%																																																																										
Not Guilty																																																																												
	1	50%																																																																										
Grand Total	2	100%																																																																										
<div>Ref</div> <div>5025776</div> <div>&5025878</div> <div>Back to top</div>	<div>IOPC case referral statistics</div>																																																																											
<div>Request</div>	<div>Do you happen to have (or know if it exists in a published form) the breakdown of:</div> <div>How many cases each of the top 10 forces has referred to the IOPC since 2019?</div> <div>How many did you take forward as independent/managed investigations?</div> <div>How many of those referrals eventually led to misconduct hearings or criminal proceedings (and if possible, convictions)?</div> <div>I would be grateful if you could provide the figures broken down so that year-on-year changes can be identified.</div> <div>Specifically:</div> <div>1.By Force and Year – the number of complaint cases logged by each police force in each calendar (or financial) year within the period covered by your dataset.</div>																																																																											

	<p>2.By Allegation Category and Year – the number of complaints recorded in each of the IOPC’s allegation categories (e.g. delivery of duties and service, police powers and procedures, individual behaviours, discriminatory behaviour, etc.), shown year-on-year for the same period.”</p>						
<u>Response</u>	<p>Please find below a spreadsheet providing the total number of referrals received by the top 10 forces since 1 April 2019 to 3 September 2025 and the MOI decisions showing the number of those referrals taken forward as independent or managed / directed investigations.</p> <p>Please be aware of the following caveats and notes when considering this data:</p> <table><tr><th>Caveats & Notes</th></tr><tr><td>Data is for illustrative purposes only.</td></tr><tr><td>This data considers overt referrals only</td></tr><tr><td>The following data is based on Referrals received by the IOPC in the period 01.04.19 to 03.09.25 (inclusive)</td></tr><tr><td>This information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.</td></tr><tr><td>The appropriate authority, as well as other case attributes, is dependent on accurate data recording in the IOPC case management system by operational teams.</td></tr></table> <p>In relation to the number of referrals that led to misconduct hearings or criminal proceedings and convictions, we are at present unable to provide this data broken down by the top ten forces over this timespan.</p> <p>We have published outcomes data relating to our independent investigations since 2018 and these can be found on our website here: Investigation outcomes reports Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC).</p> <p>The reports do not provide the data as a force breakdown. The data used to produce the statistics in this report is taken from a live system, containing a complex data set which then undergoes a data quality review prior to being published, this is a significant undertaking for the organisation to ensure we publish information that is as accurate as possible.</p> <p>At this time, to release information that is not already included in the report, such as providing a force breakdown, would require the IOPC to undertake data quality activity that would sit outside of the 18-hour cost limit threshold for responding to FOI requests. We are currently undertaking work on how we record our outcomes which will impact on how easily we can report on them in the future, this may allow us to respond to these requests in the future.</p>	Caveats & Notes	Data is for illustrative purposes only.	This data considers overt referrals only	The following data is based on Referrals received by the IOPC in the period 01.04.19 to 03.09.25 (inclusive)	This information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.	The appropriate authority, as well as other case attributes, is dependent on accurate data recording in the IOPC case management system by operational teams.
Caveats & Notes							
Data is for illustrative purposes only.							
This data considers overt referrals only							
The following data is based on Referrals received by the IOPC in the period 01.04.19 to 03.09.25 (inclusive)							
This information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.							
The appropriate authority, as well as other case attributes, is dependent on accurate data recording in the IOPC case management system by operational teams.							

	Table showing the number of received referrals from the Top 10 Appropriate Authorities since 01.04.19			
	Appropriate Authority		Received Count	
	Metropolitan Police Service		7426	
	Greater Manchester Police		2147	
	West Midlands Police		1598	
	Essex Police		1350	
	West Yorkshire Police		1328	
	Avon & Somerset Constabular		1232	
	Kent Police		1209	
	Northumbria Police		1147	
	South Wales Police		950	
	Thames Valley Police		935	
	Table showing the number of Independent and Managed/Directed Investigations decisions from Referrals received from the top 10 Aas since 01.04.19			
	Decision		Number of Cases	
	Directed Investigation		109	
	Independent Investigation		1649	
	Managed Investigation		13	
<p>We believe that these breakdowns of statistics are available in the Police Complaint Statistics for England and Wales report for each financial year.</p> <p>These reports are compiled from complaints data collected from police forces. The information we publish includes the total number of complaints recorded by each police force and a breakdown of allegation categories recorded by police and how they are concluded.</p> <p>The latest report can be found on our website here: Police complaints statistics for England and Wales report - 2023/24 Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</p> <p>The report for 2022/23 can be found here: Police complaints statistics for England and Wales report - 2022/23 Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</p> <p>The report for 2021/22 can be found here: Police complaints statistics for England and Wales report - 2021/22 Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</p> <p>The report for 2020/21 can be found here: Police complaints statistics for England and Wales report - 2020/21 Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</p> <p>The report for 2019/20 can be found here: Police complaints statistics for England and Wales report - 2019/20 Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</p> <p>We also publish bulletins relaying to each individual police force which can be found via the following page of our website: Police force data Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</p> <p>You should read these reports in conjunction with our Guidance on capturing data about police complaints Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</p>				
Ref 5025805 Back to top		Yonder Public Perceptions Tracker surveys		
Request		Please provide the following information relating to the IOPC's Public Perceptions Tracker surveys conducted by Yonder:		

	<p>1. <i>The scheduled date(s) for the next Public Perceptions Tracker survey with Yonder</i></p> <p>2. <i>The total cost paid to Yonder for each of the three most recent survey waves (8.1, 8.2, and 8.3)</i></p> <p>3. <i>A copy of the brief or instructions provided to Yonder for these surveys, including details of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>demographic targets</i> <i>any screening or profiling questions used to select participants, and</i> <i>any quotas you set for specific demographic groups (for example, Black, Asian, 18–24, LGBTQ+ respondents)</i> <p>4. <i>The number of participants who were screened out or excluded during the recruitment and survey process for each of these three waves.</i></p>
<u>Response</u>	<p>1. The next wave of fieldwork for the Public Perceptions Tracker (PPT) is scheduled for the 24th September. The second and final wave of this year is to take place by the end of January 2026; exact dates are yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>2. We cannot share this information as it is commercially sensitive. We are refusing this information because it engages the exemption under section 43(2) FOIA because it would be likely to prejudice the commercial interest of the IOPC and its contractor, and because the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure.</p> <p>3. The supplier for the Public Perceptions Tracker, which at present is Yonder, is required to survey a robust, nationally representative sample of the general public in England and Wales. The supplier is also required to analyse the quantitative data collected, including analysis by certain demographic features such as age or ethnicity, and to produce an annual report of findings.</p> <p>The screening of participants is handled by Yonder in line with their research processes. More information about the methodology for the survey, including sample sizes, can be found in the published report: Public perceptions tracker summary report - 2024/25 Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC).</p> <p>4. As mentioned in the response to question three, the sample recruitment is managed by Yonder. Therefore, we do not have any information about the number of participants who were screened out or excluded for each of the three waves.</p>