

## FOI Disclosures November 2025

### Index

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

- [Applying Standards of Professional Behaviour when determining misconduct](#)
- [Outcome of misconduct investigation relating to Paul Anderson](#)
- [Investigation and proceedings relating to Officer W80 and the shooting of Jermaine Baker](#)
- [Data regarding reviews](#)
- [Investigation into the death of Sean Rigg](#)

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>5025902</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a>	<b><u>Applying Standards of Professional Behaviour when determining misconduct</u></b>
<b><u>Request</u></b>	<p><i>Please clarify whether the IOPC holds any internal guidance, policy documents, or assessment frameworks that describe how investigators apply the Standards of Professional Behaviour and the Code of Ethics in practice when determining potential misconduct.</i></p>
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<p>We have understood this request as asking for our guidance on making a case to answer decision. Decisions on whether there may be a case to answer for a subject of an IOPC investigation are made by the IOPC decision maker (DM) in the case.</p> <p>A subject officer will have a case to answer if the IOPC decision maker determines there is sufficient evidence upon which a reasonable Chair or panel could reach a finding of misconduct or gross misconduct on the balance of probabilities. The definitions of misconduct and gross misconduct are set out at Paragraph 29 of Schedule 3 of the Police Reform Act (PRA) 2002.</p> <p>Please see below a copy of our operational guidance for decision makers.</p>

	<p><b>Guidance for decision makers in IOPC investigations:</b></p> <p>Having carefully considered the content of the investigation report, any relevant evidence and the views of the lead investigator, the DM should apply the 'case to answer test' to each, and every, allegation made against the subject officers in the investigation.</p> <p>The DM should consider whether there is sufficient evidence, upon which a reasonable misconduct meeting or a reasonable disciplinary hearing panel, could find misconduct or gross misconduct proven on the balance of probabilities.</p> <p>In doing so, DMs should apply the definitions of misconduct and gross misconduct that are set out at Paragraph 29 of Schedule 3 of the Police Reform Act (PRA) 2002:</p> <p><b>Misconduct:</b> A breach of the standards of professional behaviour  <b>Gross misconduct:</b> A breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal</p> <p>The 'elevated' definition of misconduct*, which was introduced by the 2020 regime, should <u>not</u> be applied at the case to answer stage. As such, a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPBs), even if not sufficiently serious to justify disciplinary action, will result in there being a case to answer.</p> <p>* is breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action (Regulation 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020).</p> <p>When considering the seriousness of an alleged breach of the SPBs, and differentiating between misconduct and gross misconduct, DMs should have regard to the <a href="#">College of Policing's 'Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings'</a>.</p> <p><u>Is the evidential threshold met?</u></p> <p>At the case to answer stage, the DM is not making a finding that there <u>has</u> been a breach of the SPBs, nor are they commenting on the prospects of a future panel, or meeting, reaching such a finding. The DM should be aware that a panel or meeting may conclude that the allegation(s) are not proven, and their own opinion as to whether the case should succeed is irrelevant.</p> <p>However, in deciding whether there is a case to answer, the DM must consider whether the nature and quality of the evidence is sufficient for a reasonable meeting or panel to find misconduct or gross misconduct proven. If they decide that it is, they should reach a finding that there is a case to answer.</p> <p>DMs may wish to consult Chapter 8 of the <a href="#">Home Office Guidance (HOG)</a>, which provides specific guidance on evaluating the evidence relating to each allegation. Paragraphs 8.68 – 8.76 of the HOG provide guidance to DMs on how to deal with conflicting evidence at the case to answer stage. The guidance acknowledges that there will be cases where, following an analysis of the evidence, two witness accounts appear to be equally plausible. That is to say, one of the accounts, if it</p>	<p>were proven or found to be credible, could support a finding by a reasonable panel or meeting of either misconduct or gross misconduct.</p> <p>The DM should not usually try to resolve such evidential conflicts based on witness evidence alone, and it will usually be correct for the DM to conclude there is a case to answer. DMs should be mindful that it is ultimately the role of a misconduct meeting, or hearing panel, to decide whether, or not, to accept a witness account.</p> <p>Paragraphs 8.71 – 8.76 of the HOG provide guidance to DMs on how to deal with issues surrounding the credibility of witness evidence.</p> <p>The guidance emphasises that situations presenting as 'one person's word against another' will not automatically result in the case to answer threshold being met. There will be cases where one person's account appears inherently implausible on the basis that it is contradicted by other evidence (such as CCTV or documentary evidence), or it is inherently fanciful. In these cases, the DM may determine that there is no case to answer.</p> <p>In general terms, when considering whether there is a case to answer, DMs should assess the credibility of the account as opposed to the credibility of the witness themselves.</p>
<p><b>Ref</b> <b>5025904</b></p> <p><a href="#">Back to top</a></p>	<p><b><u>Outcome of misconduct investigation relating to Paul Anderson</u></b></p>	
<p><b><u>Request</u></b></p>	<p><i>I am trying to find out outcome of the misconduct investigation into the allegations against Ex Humberside CC Paul Anderson that were reported in the national media.</i></p>	
<p><b><u>Response</u></b></p>	<p>The outcome of the investigation has yet to be shared with the relevant parties. We anticipate this will be done in the coming weeks and that a news release confirming the outcome will follow soon after.</p>	
<p><b>Ref</b> <b>5025928</b></p> <p><a href="#">Back to top</a></p>	<p><b><u>Investigation and proceedings relating to Officer W80 and the shooting of Jermaine Baker</u></b></p>	
<p><b><u>Request</u></b></p>	<p><i>I write pursuant to section 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ("FOIA") to request recorded information held by the Independent Office for Police Conduct ("IOPC") and, where relevant, its predecessor the Independent Police Complaints Commission ("IPCC"), in relation to the investigation and subsequent legal proceedings concerning Officer W80 and the fatal shooting of Jermaine Baker.</i></p> <p><b>1. Information Requested</b></p> <p><i>Please disclose, for the period 2015 to the present, any recorded information, whether in full or summary form, that sets out or quantifies expenditure and resourcing attributable to this case, including but not limited to:</i></p>	

	<p><b>(a) Legal expenditure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Costs incurred in all proceedings relating to the use-of-force legal-test litigation (judicial review, Court of Appeal, and Supreme Court).</i></li> <li>• <i>Fees or disbursements paid to external counsel, solicitors, court officials, expert witnesses, or other professional advisers.</i></li> <li>• <i>Any internal cost summaries, invoices, or management accounts recording those outgoings.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>(b) Forensic and expert services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Payments for forensic, ballistic, digital, or medical expert work commissioned for this investigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Expenditure on any laboratory submissions, reconstructions, or scene examinations.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>(c) Staffing and resourcing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The number of IOPC/IPCC officers, investigators, or staff allocated to the matter in each financial year since 2015.</i></li> <li>• <i>The civil service pay-band or grade of each category of staff assigned in each year (names not required).</i></li> <li>• <i>Recorded overtime or additional-hours payments identified as attributable to this investigation.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>(d) Operational and administrative costs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Expenditure on travel, accommodation, or subsistence arising directly from work on this case.</i></li> <li>• <i>Communications, media-handling, or publication costs specific to the investigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Any other identifiable operational outlay (e.g. transcription, secure storage, or specialist equipment hire).</i></li> </ul> <p><b>(e) Internal summaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Copies of any internal management reports, financial summaries, or board papers that aggregate or estimate the total cost of the W80/Baker investigation, reinvestigation, or related litigation.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Response</u></b></p>	<p><b>(a) Legal expenditure</b></p> <p>For the High Court, Court of Appeal, and Supreme Court proceedings in this case, you are seeking an itemised account of all IOPC expenditure on external legal fees, including copies of invoices costs summaries and internal management accounts. In relation to this expenditure, we can confirm that the IOPC did not ultimately incur any external legal costs of its own. As the IOPC was successful at the Supreme Court hearing, we were able to reclaim from the claimant the costs that we incurred in bringing this case to a hearing. This includes our external costs in respect of the judicial review and appeal court hearings, with the result that there was a zero cost to the IOPC for this litigation.</p> <p>We have decided that we are not under a duty to provide a fully itemised list of our external expenditure on these proceedings, supported by invoices where available. We have gone on to consider whether we could provide our aggregated costs instead and have concluded that this information would also be exempt because it would necessarily involve disclosure of the fees charged by legal counsel. These fees account for the overwhelming majority of the external costs that were incurred by the IOPC and were split between one senior and one junior counsel who can easily be identified from online and other sources. If we were to disclose the aggregated external expenditure, it would be easy for an educated reader to deduce the amounts charged by each barrister to a reasonable degree of accuracy when this information is not publicly available.</p>

We consider that these fees engage the exemption under section 40(2) of the FOIA, which relates to personal data about someone other than the requester when disclosure would breach any of the data protection principles contained in the UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR).

**(c) Staffing and resourcing**

We do not hold the specific information you require because staff time has not been recorded against this investigation.

We can advise, however, that in the investigation phase of approximately twelve months in 2015-2016, an Operational Team Leader (IOPC grade 13) led the investigation full time with oversight from an Operations Manager (IOPC grade 15) and support from grade 9-13 colleagues from our Operations Directorate to complete actions where required.

Post completion of the investigation in 2016, this person continued to work on the case together with other operational commitments, with ad hoc support from colleagues. This includes support for the related post-investigation proceedings.

**(b) Forensic and expert services**

**(d) Operational and administrative costs**

The costs recorded in these categories are as follows:

Expenditure Type	£
Forensics	58,364
Expenses	1,303
Investigation Consumables	1,247
Translation	639
<b>Total</b>	<b>61,553</b>

We are unable to comprehensively confirm all costs associated with investigations. The

IOPC accounting system only recorded investigation costs for known expenses and purchases prior to April 2019. Operational staff time was not separately recorded and it is not possible to account for this in the investigation costs. It is also not possible to amount for organisational overheads, media handling or other work undertaken.

From April 2019 onwards we no longer attribute purchases and expenses to individual investigations. This means that we are unable to provide a fully representative true cost of an investigation.

**(e) Internal summaries**

We do not hold information in the form of “internal management reports, financial summaries, or board papers that aggregate or estimate the total cost of the W80/Baker investigation, reinvestigation, or related litigation”.

**Ref**  
**5025955**

[Back to top](#)

**Data regarding reviews**

**Request**

From Jan 2025 - 1st Nov 2025

1. *When the public requested a review of a police complaint, what are most reviews regarding (e.g use of force/unlawful arrest)?*

2. Of the reviews requested within the above date, how many of these reviews were upheld and what percentage?
3. How many review requests involved concerns about an officer's honesty or integrity?
4. Of those reviews, how many were upheld, and what percentage does that represent?
5. How many complaints did the IOPC review in the above period?
6. How many reviews regarding police complaints were requested in the above period?
7. How many of those complaints were upheld and what percentage does this represent?

**Response**

The attached document contains the data we hold under your request.

**Case Factors & Notes**

This data considers **valid Reviews only**

The following data is based on Reviews received by the IOPC with case factors, reviews upheld and percentage. 2,218 reviews received in the above period, 271 (12%) have been upheld. Please note, reviews are not always completed in the same period of which they were received.

The following data is for the time period 01/01/2025 to 01/11/25 (inclusive).

This information is taken from live data on 13/11/2025 and as such may differ from previously published data & statistics.

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

The case factors used in this data are No Factors Selected, Failure of Duty, Discrimination & Hate Crime, Use of Force, Corruption, Digital Evidence, Police Custody, Injury, Abuse, Mental Health, Searches (inc. 3&62), Terrorism, Covert Policing, Special Powers, Exploitation.

Please note that case factors can be retrospectively added to a case, meaning some cases that were received post introduction of our new case management system (CMS) may have the new CMS factors on them.

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.

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

**IOPC reviews upheld and resolved in 2025**

**Exam Jan 2025 - 1st Nov 2025**

1. How many complaints did the IOPC review in the above period?

3. How many of those complaints were upheld and what percentage does this represent?

→ The IOPC completed 2,435 valid reviews in the above period. Of these 657 (28%) were upheld.

**Exam Jan 2025 - 1st Nov 2025**

2. How many reviews regarding police complaints were requested in the above period?

→ The IOPC received 2,218 reviews in the period.

1. When the public requested a review of a police complaint, what are most reviews regarding (e.g. use of force/unlawful arrest)?

→ Of reviews received in the period, 568 had no factors selected. Of those that did have factors selected the top ten were:

CASE FACTOR DESCRIPTION	Received Count	Total Received	Percentage
Failure of Duty	373	2218	24%
Discrimination & Hate Crime	419	2218	23%
Use of Force	464	2218	23%
Corruption	304	2218	17%
Digital Evidence	267	2218	12%
Police Custody	229	2218	11%
Injury	165	2218	8%
Abuse	148	2218	7%
Mental Health	142	2218	6%
Searches	124	2218	6%

2. Of the reviews requested within the above date, how many of these reviews were upheld and what percentage?

→ Of the 2,218 reviews received in the above period, 271 (12%) have been upheld. Reviews are not always completed in the same period that they are received.

As you may know, the police complaints legislation allows that a review may be considered either by the local policing body or by the IOPC, depending on the circumstances of the case. We have understood your request as relating to reviews considered only by the IOPC as 'relevant review body'.

On considering a review, the IOPC decides only whether the complaint was handled correctly and the outcome was reasonable and proportionate. We do not make a decision on whether the complaint should be upheld. Therefore, while do not hold data relating to whether a

	<p>complaint subject to a review has been upheld, we can confirm the number of reviews we have upheld.</p> <p>Police forces provide the IOPC with data relating to how allegations are finalised and this is published on the IOPC website in our <a href="#">Police complaints statistics   Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</a>. Data separated by force is published in our <a href="#">Police force data   Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)</a>. The allegation data recorded by police is not separated according to whether the matter was subject to a review.</p> <p>Our police force data includes, at table C1, data on all reviews completed in the relevant period. Annual review data is published in our annual police complaints statistics report.</p> <p>As the review cases decided by the IOPC have not already been classified according to any specific allegations, deciding whether any of them may include matters that could be categorised as you suggest under parts 1 and 3 above would involve the creation of new information based on a reading of each file. Our experience of this type of exercise confirms that, in at least some of these cases, we would have to make a subjective judgement on whether or not the circumstances, as indicated by a range of documents, disclose one or more of the allegations in your list. We conclude that interpreting and applying allegation types in the context of the information in these cases would require the creation of new information outside of our duties under the FOIA and, therefore, we do not hold this information.</p> <p>The attached document includes data on the case factors we have recorded in each of these review cases. Case factors are broad themes applied by operational staff that may apply in a number of circumstances. They should not be understood as confirming the nature of any allegations. The case factors provide us with a starting point to identify potential themes and a case would require further scrutiny to validate that it falls within the scope of that theme. Case factors may also change during the course of a case.</p>
<p><b>Ref</b> <b><u>5025982</u></b> <a href="#">Back to top</a></p>	<p><b><u>Investigation into the death of Sean Rigg</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>Request</u></b></p>	<p><i>Please could you provide a copy of the report of the original IPCC investigation into the death of Sean Rigg.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Response</u></b></p>	<p>We have made extensive publications regarding this investigation including the 162 page report and a further review report which are still available on the National Archives website here: <a href="https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20131004165058/http://www.ipcc.gov.uk/investigations/sean-rigg-metropolitan-police-service">https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20131004165058/http://www.ipcc.gov.uk/investigations/sean-rigg-metropolitan-police-service</a> .</p>

	Further information regarding this investigation is available on our website here: <a href="https://www.policeconduct.gov.uk/search/content?keys=sean+rigg">https://www.policeconduct.gov.uk/search/content?keys=sean+rigg</a>
--	--