

## FOI Disclosures March 2025

### Index

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

- [Number of referrals across Police Forces](#)
- [Non Disclosure Agreements](#)
- [Police Sexual Assault allegations](#)
- [IOPC investigations, complaints and settlements relating to Surrey Police](#)
- [IOPC Employee Suspensions](#)
- [Bianca Williams stop and search investigations](#)

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>5025307</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>Number of referrals across Police Forces</u></b>
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<i>"Please can you provide information about the number of referrals that have been received by the IOPC in 2024. Please can you also break it down by each force."</i>
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<p>Please see attached a table containing the data you have requested</p> <p><b>Caveats &amp; Notes</b> 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 01.01.24 to 31.12.24 (inclusive) This information is taken from live data and as such may differ from previously published data &amp; 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.</p>

Table showing the number of referrals received between 01.01.24 - 31.12.24 by Appropriate Authority		
Appropriate Authority	Referrals Received	
Avon & Somerset Constabulary	248	
Bedfordshire Police	87	
British Transport Police	71	
Cambridgeshire Constabulary	82	
Cheshire Constabulary	123	
City of London Police	38	
Civil Nuclear Constabulary	12	
Cleveland - Police and Crime Panel	1	
Cleveland Police	143	
Cumbria Constabulary	116	
Cumbria Local Policing Body	1	
Derbeysire Local Policing Body	1	
Derbyshire Constabulary	171	
Devon & Cornwall Local Policing Body	3	
Devon & Cornwall Police	181	
Dorset Police	31	
Durham Constabulary	65	
Dyfed-Powys Police	45	
Essex - Police and Crime Panel	1	
Essex Police	230	
Essex Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner	1	
Gloucestershire Constabulary	79	
Gloucestershire Local Policing Body		2
Greater Manchester Police		378
Gwent Police		99
Hampshire - Police and Crime Panel		1
Hampshire Constabulary		169
Hertfordshire Constabulary		93
HMRC - Commissioners		65
Home Office Law enforcement body (previously known as UKBA)		15
Humberside - Police and Crime Panel		2
Humberside Local Policing Body		1
Humberside Police		101
Kent Local Policing Body		2
Kent Police		194
Lancashire Constabulary		189
Lancashire Local Policing Body		1
Leicestershire Local Policing Body		3
Leicestershire Police		137
Lincolnshire Police		86
Merseyside Local Policing Body		1
Merseyside Police		92
Metropolitan Police Service		1218
Ministry of Defence		6
National Crime Agency		13
Norfolk Constabulary		100

	North Wales Police	51
	North Yorkshire Police	161
	North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner	1
	Northamptonshire Local Policing Body	8
	Northamptonshire Police	68
	Northumbria Local Policing Body	1
	Northumbria Police	230
	Nottinghamshire - Police and Crime Panel	3
	Nottinghamshire Local Policing Body	2
	Nottinghamshire Police	159
	South Wales - Police and Crime Panel	1
	South Wales Police	193
	South Yorkshire Local Policing Body	1
	South Yorkshire Police	128
	Staffordshire Local Policing Body	2
	Staffordshire Police	88
	Suffolk Constabulary	86
	Surrey Police	154
	Sussex Police	115
	Thames Valley Police	195
	Warwickshire Police	67
	West Mercia Police	88
	West Midlands Local Policing Body	1
	West Midlands Police	313
	West Yorkshire Police	236
	Wiltshire Police	61
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>7111</b>
<b><u>Ref</u></b> <b><u>5025310</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>Non Disclosure Agreements</u></b>	
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<p>1. <i>The number of non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) or similar confidentiality agreements signed by family members of victims in relation to the Valdo Calocane case in Nottinghamshire.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The date range during which these agreements were signed.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The general purpose or scope of these agreements, without revealing personal or sensitive details.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Any policy or guidance documents related to the use of such agreements in cases involving victims' families.</i></p> <p>5. <i>The total cost, if any, associated with the creation and implementation of these agreements.</i></p>	
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<p>1. The IOPC holds this information but we are refusing to provide it because it is exempt under section 40(2) of the FOIA. Section 40(2) applies to personal data about someone other than the requester when disclosure would breach any of the data protection principles</p>	

contained in the UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR).

Having taken into account the level of publicity around the Valdo Calocane case, we consider that the family members who signed these agreements would be reasonably likely to be identified by the media and other interested parties should the number of signatories be combined with information which is in the public domain or accessible to a motivated intruder.

Confirmation of the number of family members who have signed these confidentiality agreements would serve the legitimate interest of contributing to public scrutiny of how the IOPC has discharged its statutory functions under this investigation. This would also serve the more general interest in openness and in accountability for decision making and the use of public funds.

The test of necessity under Article 6(1)(f) involves consideration of any alternative measures which may make disclosure of the requested information unnecessary. In our view, compliance with this part of your request is not the least intrusive means of achieving the legitimate aim in question when we are confirming in answer to your other questions the purpose of these agreements and why they are consistent with our duties under the Police Reform Act 2002.

We find, therefore, that disclosure is not necessary to meet the legitimate aim we have identified and that the first part of your request engages section 40(2) in the absence of a lawful basis for disclosure under Article 6 UK GDPR.

Had we accepted that disclosure of this information was necessary, we would have considered whether the legitimate aim in question was overridden by the right and freedoms of the family members. At least some of the parties concerned would have no reasonable expectation of being identified by the IOPC as signatories to this agreement. This would be likely to cause them, and their friends and families, unwarranted damage and distress in addition to the distress already suffered as a result of the incident involving Mr Calocane.

It is clear to us, therefore, that the legitimate aim being pursued would be overridden by the interests of the data subjects if we had concluded that the test of necessity was met.

2. All signed on or around 14 November 2024.
3. You may be aware that IOPC Director Derrick Campbell made this statement on 6 February:

*"We completed an investigation into Leicestershire Police contact with Valdo Calocane prior to the killings and in particular the actions and decisions of officers investigating alleged assaults by him.*

*In order to share our report and underlying evidence with the families of his victims at the earliest opportunity, a confidentiality agreement was needed. It remains in place until an appropriate time when the investigation findings and outcomes can be published, which we anticipate being able to do in coming weeks."*

The agreements include the following:

*"We the undersigned agree not to disclose any information provided to us by the IOPC to any third party without having obtained the prior written agreement of the IOPC. That agreement not to be unreasonably withheld but where given will be conditional on the recipient signing an undertaking in these same terms.*

*The IOPC agree to review the necessity for this undertaking at the conclusion of any Victims Right to Review application and any subsequent criminal proceedings and to release the parties from it insofar as it is no longer necessary."*

4. There are no policy or guidance documents.

Under sections 20 and 21 Police Reform Act 2002 there is a duty to provide information to complainants and interested persons about the progress of the investigation. There is no duty to make this information public.

Further, the exceptions in regulation 35 Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2020 to the duty to provide information to complainants and interested persons include that the information may enter the public domain and prejudice actual or potential proceedings and the rights of third parties under Data Protection Act 2018 and Human Rights Act 1998.

It follows that information may have to be withheld from complainants and interested persons if we cannot be assured it will not be made public prior to any proceedings being concluded and/or that it will be appropriately anonymised under data protection legislation.

Therefore, to provide the fullest amount of information to complainants and interested persons as early as possible, we may ask that they agree in writing to keep it confidential, with the caveats as set out in the wording above.

5. The agreement was drafted in house using standard wording and there were no legal fees. It would have taken approximately 18 minutes to prepare and the charge for this time would be recorded on our time recording system as having a value of £63.

<div>Ref</div> <div>5025311</div> <div>Back to top</div>	<div>Police Sexual Assault allegations</div>																																																																								
<div>Request</div>	<div><p>“According to Police Complaint Statistics 22/23, there were 8 allegations of sexual assault which were handled outside of Schedule 3, and 3 allegations of an abuse of power for sexual purposes also handled outside of Schedule 3.</p><p>Please share the following information regarding these 11 allegations, listing the nature of the allegation for each response:</p><div><div>1.</div><div>If known, why was this complaint handled outside of Schedule 3?</div></div><div><div>2.</div><div>What was the outcome of the complaint?</div></div><div><div>3.</div><div>Gender of the complainant</div></div><div><div>4.</div><div>What type of response was issued?</div></div><div><div>a.</div><div>If possible, please share the response while censoring any personal information</div></div><div><div>5.</div><div>Which police force was accused?”</div></div></div>																																																																								
<div>Response</div>	<div><p>Please see attached a table containing most of the data you have requested. We do not hold information about the reason why these allegations were handled outside of Schedule 3.</p><p>The <a href="#">IOPC Guidance on capturing data about police complaints</a> includes, at paragraphs 7.4 to 7.6 (pages 18-19), our guidance to professional standards departments on the recording and reporting of allegation decisions and allegation actions under complaints handled outside of Schedule 3. These allegations can be ‘Resolved’ or ‘Not Resolved’ with one or more of the actions listed in paragraph 7.6.</p><table><tr><th>Organisation Name</th><th>Allegation Result Grouping</th><th>Actions On Allegations Outside Schedule 3</th><th>Category</th><th>Subcategory</th><th>Gender</th></tr><tr><td>Dorset</td><td>Resolved</td><td>Explanation</td><td>Sexual conduct</td><td>Sexual assault</td><td>Male</td></tr><tr><td>Surrey</td><td>Not Resolved</td><td>No further action</td><td>Sexual conduct</td><td>Sexual assault</td><td>Male</td></tr><tr><td>Surrey</td><td>Resolved</td><td>Explanation</td><td>Sexual conduct</td><td>Sexual assault</td><td>Male</td></tr><tr><td>Surrey</td><td>Resolved</td><td>No further action</td><td>Abuse of position/ corruption</td><td>Abuse of position for sexual purpose</td><td>Female</td></tr><tr><td>Hampshire</td><td>Resolved</td><td>Explanation</td><td>Sexual conduct</td><td>Sexual assault</td><td>Male</td></tr><tr><td>Hampshire</td><td>Resolved</td><td>Explanation</td><td>Sexual conduct</td><td>Sexual assault</td><td>Male</td></tr><tr><td>Nottinghamshire</td><td>Not Resolved</td><td>No further action</td><td>Sexual conduct</td><td>Sexual assault</td><td>Female</td></tr><tr><td>West Midlands</td><td>Resolved</td><td>No further action</td><td>Sexual conduct</td><td>Sexual assault</td><td>Unknown</td></tr><tr><td>Northumbria</td><td>Resolved</td><td>Explanation</td><td>Abuse of position/ corruption</td><td>Abuse of position for sexual purpose</td><td>Unknown</td></tr><tr><td>Northumbria</td><td>Resolved</td><td>Explanation</td><td>Abuse of position/ corruption</td><td>Abuse of position for sexual purpose</td><td>Female</td></tr><tr><td>West Mercia</td><td>Not Resolved</td><td>Other action</td><td>Sexual conduct</td><td>Sexual assault</td><td>Unknown</td></tr></table></div>	Organisation Name	Allegation Result Grouping	Actions On Allegations Outside Schedule 3	Category	Subcategory	Gender	Dorset	Resolved	Explanation	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male	Surrey	Not Resolved	No further action	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male	Surrey	Resolved	Explanation	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male	Surrey	Resolved	No further action	Abuse of position/ corruption	Abuse of position for sexual purpose	Female	Hampshire	Resolved	Explanation	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male	Hampshire	Resolved	Explanation	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male	Nottinghamshire	Not Resolved	No further action	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Female	West Midlands	Resolved	No further action	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Unknown	Northumbria	Resolved	Explanation	Abuse of position/ corruption	Abuse of position for sexual purpose	Unknown	Northumbria	Resolved	Explanation	Abuse of position/ corruption	Abuse of position for sexual purpose	Female	West Mercia	Not Resolved	Other action	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Unknown
Organisation Name	Allegation Result Grouping	Actions On Allegations Outside Schedule 3	Category	Subcategory	Gender																																																																				
Dorset	Resolved	Explanation	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male																																																																				
Surrey	Not Resolved	No further action	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male																																																																				
Surrey	Resolved	Explanation	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male																																																																				
Surrey	Resolved	No further action	Abuse of position/ corruption	Abuse of position for sexual purpose	Female																																																																				
Hampshire	Resolved	Explanation	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male																																																																				
Hampshire	Resolved	Explanation	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Male																																																																				
Nottinghamshire	Not Resolved	No further action	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Female																																																																				
West Midlands	Resolved	No further action	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Unknown																																																																				
Northumbria	Resolved	Explanation	Abuse of position/ corruption	Abuse of position for sexual purpose	Unknown																																																																				
Northumbria	Resolved	Explanation	Abuse of position/ corruption	Abuse of position for sexual purpose	Female																																																																				
West Mercia	Not Resolved	Other action	Sexual conduct	Sexual assault	Unknown																																																																				
<div>Ref</div> <div>5025323</div> <div>Back to top</div>	<div>IOPC investigations, complaints and settlements relating to Surrey Police</div>																																																																								
<div>Request</div>	<div><p>Please provide the following details regarding IOPC investigations, complaints, and settlements related to Surrey Police from January 1, 2020, to the present:</p><div><div>1. Total Number of Complaints Against Surrey Police</div><div>-The total number of complaints made against Surrey Police annually from 2020 – present.</div><div>-The number of complaints handled internally by Surrey Police.</div><div>-The number of complaints escalated to the IOPC for independent review.</div><div>-Categories of Complaints Against Surrey Police</div></div></div>																																																																								

	<p><i>2.Breakdown of complaints by category, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>-Excessive force &amp; police brutality</i></li> <li><i>-Unlawful arrest &amp; wrongful detention</i></li> <li><i>-Failure to properly investigate complaints</i></li> <li><i>-Data breaches &amp; improper handling of SARs</i></li> <li><i>-Evidence tampering or suppression</i></li> <li><i>-IOPC Investigations into Surrey Police Misconduct</i></li> </ul> <p><i>3.How many formal IOPC investigations into Surrey Police have been conducted.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>-How many resulted in findings of misconduct or gross misconduct.</i></li> <li><i>-The outcomes of those investigations, including:</i></li> <li><i>-Warnings, disciplinary actions, dismissals, or criminal charges against officers.</i></li> <li><i>-Cases where no action was taken despite misconduct being found.</i></li> <li><i>-Compensation &amp; Settlements Related to Police Misconduct</i></li> </ul> <p><i>4. The total number of financial settlements paid by Surrey Police (or through SEERPIC) due to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>-Unlawful arrest &amp; false imprisonment</i></li> <li><i>-Excessive force &amp; police brutality</i></li> <li><i>-Human rights violations</i></li> <li><i>-Data breaches &amp; SAR mishandling</i></li> <li><i>-The largest &amp; smallest settlement amounts each year.</i></li> <li><i>-Internal IOPC Guidance on Police Data Handling &amp; SAR Compliance</i></li> </ul> <p><i>5.Any internal IOPC policy documents related to police obligations in handling SARs and forensic data.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>-Guidance or reports on police forces failing to comply with SAR and data retention laws.</i></li> <li><i>-If any part of this request exceeds the cost limit, please provide the data available within the limit and advise how I may refine my request.</i></li> </ul>
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<p>Questions 1 and 2: The IOPC collects data from police forces about the number and types of complaints they record and how they are handled. We publish this data in an annual report 'Police Complaints: Statistics for England and Wales' and quarterly force performance bulletins. This data is accessible on the <a href="#">Police complaints statistics</a> page of our website, which includes links to our current and previous annual statistical reports and force performance data. The bulletins for Surrey Police are available <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>Allegation categories and sub-categories are reported in accordance with our <a href="#">Guidance on capturing data about police complaints   Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</a>, which supports the police service to capture accurate and consistent information about complaints.</p> <p>Data about reviews received and completed, broken down by whether the review body was the local policing body or IOPC, is reported at section C1 (page 11) of the bulletins. Annual data including outcomes of reviews separated by force is</p>

available in our Annual Complaints Statistics. Please see for example Tables 24-27 on pages 33-36 of our [report for 2023/24](#).

As this complaints information is accessible to you on our website, we are not required to disclose it to you separately in response to your request. This is because such information is exempt under section 21 of the FOIA, which relates to information reasonably accessible to the applicant.

You also ask about IOPC investigations broken down by complaints category. We would emphasise that complaints account for only a minority of the matters referred to and subsequently investigated by the IOPC. Most IOPC investigations relate either to 'conduct matters' or 'death or serious injury (DSI) matters', neither of which involve public complaint. For an explanation of these case types please see the Glossary at Annex G of the [Independent Review of the IOPC](#). Our complaints statistics do not include data about these case types.

The data relating to the case types that underlie our investigations is complex because a single investigation may relate to a number of referrals of different case types. We do not record information about allegations investigated by the IOPC and many of our cases do not involve specific allegations.

Section E (page 15) of our force bulletins includes information about referrals to the IOPC in the relevant period and our mode of investigation decisions on them. This data confirms, therefore, the number of Surrey Police referrals investigated by the IOPC and the number passed back to the force.

We anticipate that our force performance bulletins for 2024/25 quarter 3 will be available on our website in the next two or three weeks.

For more information about conduct matters, DSI matters and referrals to the IOPC please see our [Statutory Guidance on the police complaints system](#).

Information about specific IOPC investigations relating to Surrey Police is available on our website. On [this page of our website](#) you can filter our published summaries of completed IOPC investigations by police force and other criteria.

It may also help you to know that official statistics relating to police misconduct and complaints, including data separated by force, are published by the Home Office: [Police misconduct, England and Wales: year ending 31 March 2024 - GOV.UK](#)

3. The table below relates to IOPC decisions on our independent investigations for Surrey Police completed between 1 January 2020 and 15 February 2025.



Row Labels	No of Cases
Case to answer Gross Misconduct - Misconduct Hearing	4
Case to Answer Misconduct - Misconduct Meeting	7
No conduct	7
No conduct - management action?	3
No case to answer	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>23</b>
<p>This data is provided with the caveat that the quality of investigations data depends on the manual data input of information by investigations staff. While this data is an accurate representation of what has been recorded on our systems, we are aware that it is unlikely to be complete. Its reliability has not been subject to quality audit and this information should therefore be used for illustrative purposes only.</p>	
<p>We have decided that the work we would have to carry out to retrieve the outcomes of criminal and misconduct proceedings completed during this period would exceed the cost limit under section 12 of the FOIA with the result that we are not required to provide this information.</p>	
<p>The IOPC has not extracted reliable data about these outcome types from which we could source our response. We know from the work we carry out to produce our published investigations outcomes data that the status and outcome of external proceedings cannot easily be confirmed from a search of our case papers and will often require further enquiries with internal and external parties.</p>	
<p>It is important to emphasise that some of the misconduct and criminal proceedings concluded in this period would not be included in the 23 cases in the above table because they would relate to IOPC investigations completed before 1 January. Owing to the lack of reliable data that would allow us to narrow the number of cases to be searched and the long delays that can occur between the end of our investigations and completion of related proceedings, this data would have to be identified from manual searches of the Surrey investigations completed in the years before 1 January 2020.</p>	
<p>We do not hold data about the outcomes of any civil actions against the police in respect of the matters that we investigate. The police are not required to report this information to the IOPC.</p>	
<p>4. The IOPC does not hold this information. We would recommend that you request this directly from Surrey Police.</p>	
<p>5. This information is not held by the IOPC. Compliance with UK GDPR is regulated by the Information Commissioner's Office and the IOPC is not routinely involved in complaints about the handling of subject access requests by police.</p>	
<p>Policing guidance relating to information management (including data protection) and forensic investigation is accessible in the Authorised Professional Practice (APP) published by the College of Policing:</p>	

	<a href="#">Information management   College of Policing</a> <a href="#">Forensics   College of Policing</a>  APP is the official source of professional practice for policing.
<b><u>Ref</u></b> <b><u>5025332</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>IOPC Employee Suspensions</u></b>
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<p>1. The number of employees currently suspended on full pay within your agency/department.</p> <p>2. The total duration (in days) of each of these suspensions.</p> <p>3. The estimated total cost to the public purse for these suspensions.”</p>
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<p>In response to question one, we can confirm that one member of staff is currently suspended on full pay.</p> <p>Due to the fact that this is a low number, we find that responding to questions two and three could enable IOPC staff to identify this person and as a result we consider that we are not obliged to respond to these questions by virtue of FOIA exemptions at section 40(2), which relates to personal data.</p>
<b><u>Ref</u></b> <b><u>5025351</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>Bianca Williams stop and search investigation</u></b>
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<p>“1. I request that the IOPC release the officers witness statements from the stop and search that took place in July 2020 involving British athlete Bianca Williams. This information should be disclosed as it is in the public interest to provide transparency. This was a widely publicised case.</p> <p>2. I request that IOPC release all unedited body worn video of the officers involved in the stop. Again, this in the public interest as it would provide transparency. “</p>
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<p>Thank you for your information request received on 2 May 2025. We have</p> <p>The investigation report is published on our website here: <a href="#">Ms Bianca Williams and Mr Ricardo Dos Santos investigation report   Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</a>. This publication is in line with <a href="#">our Policy on the publication of final investigation reports and summaries</a>. We have also released the following statement: <a href="#">Statement following misconduct hearing over stop and search of Bianca Williams and Ricardo Dos Santos   Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</a>.</p> <p>The report includes relevant excerpts from statements of the officers involved in this case within the ‘Summary and analysis of evidence section’. We have decided that this information is sufficient to meet the public interest in this case and we are refusing disclosure of the full witness statements by virtue of exemptions under sections 30 and 40 of the FOIA relating to investigations and proceedings and personal data.</p> <p>In the case of information falling within the terms of section 30, we are refusing your request because the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure.</p>

A summary of this investigation has been published on our web site in line with our [Policy on the publication of final investigation reports and report summaries | Independent Office for Police Conduct \(IOPC\)](#). We consider this information to be a proportionate response to the public interest in transparency and accountability, taking into account the competing public interest in preserving the confidentiality of investigations and the persons to whom they relate.

Whilst disclosure of the statements may enable the public to see how the investigation had been carried out, we still consider that the legitimate interest is met by the publications available on our website. Publishing the statements as well would not make the police any more accountable nor the public any better informed and would do little to advance any broader interests in transparency. It would however be more intrusive towards the privacy of the individuals identified in this report.

Turning to your second question, recordings of body worn video were released to media outlets who requested the footage which had been played at the gross misconduct hearing and had been authorised for media release by the legally qualified chair.

The footage released was taken from the body-worn cameras of the officers who were involved in the detention of Bianca Williams and Ricardo Dos Santos and this has been published by various media outlets and is already in the public domain via the following links:

[BBC](#),  
[Sky News](#),  
[Bianca Williams](#)  
[Ricardo Dos Santos](#),  
[Met Police officer 'thought he could smell cannabis' coming from car of Team GB sprinter Bianca Williams and her athlete boyfriend Ricardo Dos Santos before they were stopped and searched, misconduct hearing told | Daily Mail Online](#)

Footage from the body worn video of one of the officers has not been released into the public domain as it did not form part of the misconduct proceedings and was therefore not relevant to the decisions of the panel. It is not currently held in a format that can be disclosed because it includes images of identifiable passers-by and number plates which constitute the personal data of those individuals.

The activities involved in removing this personal data would create a disproportionate burden upon the IOPC. We have decided that, given the extensive information already in the public domain, it is not necessary to release unedited footage in response to your request.