

Investigation name:	[Redacted]
IOPC reference:	2024/203573

## > Summary of IOPC conclusions

---

A summary of our conclusions and our rationale is set out below.

### > Cleveland Police - death or serious injury referral

---

**We found no indication that any person serving with the police may have committed a criminal offence or behaved in a manner that would justify the bringing of disciplinary proceedings.**

#### > Performance

The investigation report sets out the decisions and actions that were taken by officers in response to this incident, and subsequently the actions of the police dog. It also sets out the evidence available relating to the police's contact with the man before he sustained his injuries, and whether officers acted in accordance with legislation, local and national policies and procedures, and their training.

It also examines whether there was any evidence that the officers may have caused or contributed to the man's injuries. We considered:

- (i) whether any person to whose conduct the investigation relates has a case to answer for misconduct or gross misconduct, or has no case to answer
- (ii) whether or not disciplinary proceedings should be brought, and if so, what form they should take (particularly, the seriousness of any breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour)
- (iii) whether the performance of any person to whose conduct the investigation related is unsatisfactory and whether or not performance proceedings should be brought against any such person; and
- (iv) whether or not any matter that was the subject of the investigation should be referred to be dealt with under the reflective practice review process.

We found no indication that any person serving with the police may have committed a criminal offence or behaved in a manner that would justify the bringing of disciplinary proceedings.

We are satisfied that the officers involved in this incident acted in accordance with the relevant policies and procedures in place. We accepted that the man sustained his injuries as a result of being bitten by the police dog, but found that the use of the police dog was necessary, reasonable and proportionate in the circumstances.

Cleveland Police is not required to make a determination because we are satisfied that the investigation does not raise any performance issues.

### > Learning

We carefully considered whether there were any learning opportunities arising from the investigation. We make learning recommendations to improve policing and public confidence in the police complaints system and to prevent a recurrence of similar incidents.

We did not identify any organisational learning in this case.

