Out of Court Resolutions Scrutiny Panel - Scrutiny Outcomes and Assurance Report
30 June 2026

The Out of Court Resolutions Scrutiny Panel is an independent forum established to strengthen transparency, accountability, and public confidence by reviewing how the Force handles specific cases and identifying opportunities for learning and improvement.

The Panel does not have the authority to change the outcome of any case, nor can its feedback overturn original decisions. Only the Force may revisit a decision where it considers the original outcome to be unlawful or unsafe. The Panel's observations may, however, highlight issues requiring further consideration, organisational learning, or remedial action. Its role is advisory rather than determinative, providing independent insight that supports continuous improvement in policing practice.

This Outcomes Report provides a clear and structured overview of the Panel's considerations and conclusions. It sets out:

- **Key Questions** - The primary lines of enquiry examined by the Panel
- **RAG Rating** - The Panel's assessment of the police response to each question, using the Red/Amber/Green framework
- **Panel Feedback** - Collective observations, concerns, and positive practice identified by panel members
- **Force Response** - The formal response from the Force, outlining actions to strengthen practice, improve accountability, and enhance public confidence
- **Overall RAG Rating** - A traffic-light judgement summarising the Panel's level of assurance regarding how the case was handled overall
- **Panel Conclusion Summary** - A concise explanation of the rationale behind the rating, highlighting key strengths, areas of concern, and required improvements

CASE 1 - ADULTS			
Key Questions	**RAG Rating**	**Panel Feedback**	**Force Response**
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with a caution for common assault. Given the absence of any previous offending history, the circumstances surrounding the incident, and the victim's decision not to support a prosecution, the use of an out-of-court resolution (OoCR) was considered justified and proportionate to the offence.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender demonstrated genuine remorse and was apologetic. Given the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate and well supported by the offender's circumstances.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or	**Green**	The victim did not support a prosecution and provided a negative PNB entry. The victim's views and wishes were	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?		clearly considered as part of the decision-making process.	

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case reflects strong, professional, and proportionate practice, with decisions that were lawful, well-reasoned, and aligned with policing values. The offender was issued with a caution for common assault, which was considered an appropriate OoCR given the circumstances of the offence, their genuine remorse, and lack of previous offending history. The victim did not support a prosecution and provided a negative PNB entry, with their views clearly considered as part of the decision-making process. Overall, the outcome was proportionate and supported by both the offender's circumstances and the victim's wishes.

CASE 2 - ADULTS

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Amber**	An adult conditional caution was issued for theft. While similar cases may have been progressed through the prosecution route, the decision to use an OoCR was broadly appropriate in the circumstances. However, the rationale would have benefitted from greater clarity and consistency to fully demonstrate the proportionality of the OoCR and support the decision-making process.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	Given the offender's admission of guilt, the decision to issue an OoCR was considered suitable and justified.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The return of the stolen goods helped to mitigate the harm caused to the victim. In addition, the conditional caution ensured that appropriate interventions were completed to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour and reduce the risk of reoffending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case reflects professional and proportionate practice. An adult conditional caution was issued for theft, which was considered an appropriate OoCR given the offender's admission of guilt. The return of the stolen goods helped mitigate the harm caused to the victim, and the conditions attached to the caution addressed the underlying causes of the offending behaviour and reduced the risk of reoffending. While the

	outcome was justified, the rationale could have been more clearly articulated to better demonstrate the proportionality of the OoCR.

CASE 3 - ADULTS

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Red**	The offender was issued with an adult conditional caution for two offences of shop theft, possession of a bladed article, and possession of a Class B drug. The offences were committed in February 2026, however, the offender had previously received a 12-month conditional discharge in July 2025. As the offending occurred during the operational period of the conditional discharge, these matters should not have been dealt with by way of an OoCR and should instead have been referred back to court. Concerns were raised as to whether the offender's previous history had been fully considered during the decision-making process. The use of an OoCR in these circumstances appears disproportionate and raises concerns regarding compliance with force policy and the appropriate application of eligibility criteria.	**Action: That the Force will reinforce OoCR decision-making processes and provide feedback to relevant officers to ensure live conditional discharges and offending history are identified and appropriately considered, with cases referred back to court where required, in line with force policy and OoCR eligibility criteria.**
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Red**	Although the offender was apologetic, their offending history did not support the use of an OoCR. As a result, the rationale for issuing an OoCR was undermined.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	While the conditional caution included interventions intended to address the offending behaviour, the offender was subject to a live 12-month conditional discharge at the time of the offences.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Red	This case highlights areas for improvement in decision-making and compliance with the OoCR policy. An adult conditional caution was issued while the offender was subject to a live 12-month conditional discharge, indicating that the matter may have been more appropriately referred back to court. The offender's previous history also suggests that suitability for an OoCR may not have been fully considered against the eligibility criteria. Although the conditional caution

	included rehabilitative conditions, the OoCR was not fully aligned with policy requirements in these circumstances. This case provides a valuable learning opportunity to reinforce policy compliance and support consistent decision-making in future cases.

CASE 4 - ADULTS

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Red**	The offender was issued with a simple caution for shop theft, despite the Force no longer using simple cautions as an OoCR option. The rationale for this outcome is unclear. The offender had initially been accepted onto the Divert Scheme but failed to engage with the process. The subsequent OoCR decision raises concerns regarding compliance with force policy and the appropriate application of OoCR processes.	**Action: That the Force provides feedback to Response Officers to reinforce compliance with OoCR policy, ensuring OoCR decisions are appropriately justified, clearly documented, and aligned with approved OoCR options, particularly where offenders fail to engage with diversionary interventions.**
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Amber**	The offender admitted the offence, and the initial decision to refer them to the Divert Scheme was appropriate. However, when the offender failed to engage, the subsequent decision to issue a simple caution was not in line with force policy. While there is evidence of an admission and an opportunity for diversion was provided, the inappropriate use of an OoCR raises concerns regarding the overall suitability and proportionality of the outcome.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Amber**	The original decision to refer the offender to the Divert Scheme was appropriate and had the potential to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour. However, when the offender failed to engage, the subsequent decision to issue a simple caution was not in accordance with force policy and was insufficient to address the offending behaviour. As a result, the final OoCR was inappropriate and undermined the intended rehabilitative outcome.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Amber	This case highlights an opportunity to improve consistency in applying force policy and OoCR processes. While the offender admitted the offence and the initial referral to the Divert Scheme was appropriate, their subsequent non-engagement presented a change in circumstances that may have warranted further consideration before determining the final outcome. The rationale for issuing a simple caution is not fully documented, making it difficult to understand how the decision aligned with current OoCR guidance. Although efforts were made to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour, the final OoCR did not fully support the intended rehabilitative aims of the original intervention. This case provides useful learning to reinforce decision-making, record rationale clearly, and ensure outcomes are aligned with policy and objectives.

CASE 5 - NOT ASSESSED (DUPLICATION OF CASE 3)

CASE 6 - ADULTS

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offence involved possession of a Class A drug (Cocaine). An OoCR was issued, with the offender referred to a drug support agency. The offender had no previous history of drug-related offending. The decision was proportionate to the circumstances, clearly justified, and consistent with force policy and comparable cases, with an appropriate focus on addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender was not formally interviewed, although Class A drugs were found in their possession. There was no clear record of an admission of guilt; however, the offender had no previous history of drug-related offending. Despite the limited evidence of admission, the decision to issue an OoCR and refer the offender to a drug support agency was proportionate and supported by the offender's circumstances, with an appropriate focus on addressing the underlying causes of the behaviour.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient	**Green**	This was a state-based offence. The referral to a drug support agency was an appropriate and proportionate intervention, with a clear focus on addressing the underlying	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

to address the causes of the offending behaviour?		causes of the offending behaviour and reducing the likelihood of future offending.	

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case reflects proportionate decision-making. The offender was found in possession of a Class A drug (Cocaine) and, having no previous history of drug-related offending, was appropriately dealt with through an OoCR. The OoCR was clearly justified, consistent with force policy, and focused on addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour through referral to a drug support agency. While there was no formal interview or clearly recorded admission, the overall outcome was reasonable and proportionate, providing an intervention aimed at reducing future offending and supporting rehabilitation.

CASE 7 - ADULTS

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offence involved possession of a Class B drug. An OoCR was issued, with the offender referred to a drug support agency. The outcome was proportionate to the circumstances and provided an appropriate intervention focused on addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender was not formally interviewed, although Class B drugs were found in their possession. There was no clear record of an admission of guilt, which limits the evidential basis for the OoCR.	**Action: That the Force undertakes work to ensure that admissions of guilt for drug offences are clearly identified and recorded.**
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	This was a state-based offence. The referral to a drug support agency was an appropriate and proportionate intervention, aimed at addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour and reducing the risk of future offending. The OoCR demonstrated a clear focus on diversion, support, and rehabilitation.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case demonstrates proportionate and well-reasoned decision-making. The offender was dealt with through an OoCR for possession of a Class B drug and referred to a drug support agency, providing an appropriate intervention focused on addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour. While there was no formal interview or clearly recorded admission of guilt, the OoCR was consistent with the circumstances of the offence and reflected a positive

	approach to diversion, rehabilitation, and reducing the risk of future offending.

CASE 8 - ADULTS

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with an OoCR for burglary. Arrangements were made for the suspect to repay the victim, with staff at the premises willing to facilitate the reimbursement. The OoCR was proportionate to the circumstances of the offence and provided an appropriate resolution that addressed the harm caused while promoting offender accountability.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	Although the offender was not formally interviewed, there was an admission of guilt and they were willing to reimburse the victim for the goods taken. In the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's personal circumstances.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victim did not support a prosecution, and their views and wishes were clearly considered and appropriately reflected in the decision-making process. The OoCR promoted accountability, reduced the risk of reoffending, and provided a proportionate resolution.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case demonstrates proportionate and well-reasoned decision-making. The offender was dealt with through an OoCR for burglary, with arrangements made to reimburse the victim for the goods taken. The offender accepted responsibility for their actions, and had no previous offending history, making the OoCR appropriate and proportionate. The victim did not support a prosecution, and their views were clearly considered in the decision-making process. The outcome addressed the harm caused, promoted offender accountability, and provided an effective resolution with a focus on preventing future offending.

CASE 9 - ADULTS

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS	**Red**	For the offence of possession of a Class C drug, the offender was issued with an OoCR requiring completion of a drug awareness course. However, the offender had previously	**See action detailed at Case 3.**

Code for Crown Prosecutors?		received a 12-month conditional discharge in December 2025 for possession of a Class B drug. As the offence was committed during the operational period of that conditional discharge, the matter should not have been dealt with through an OoCR and should instead have been referred back to court.	
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Red**	Although the offender admitted the offence, their offending history and existing conditional discharge did not support the use of an OoCR. Consequently, the issuing an OoCR was not appropriate.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	While the drug awareness course aimed to address the offending behaviour, the offender was subject to a live 12-month conditional discharge at the time of the offence.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Red	This case highlights an opportunity to reinforce compliance with OoCR policy and decision-making processes. The offender was issued with an OoCR for possession of a Class C drug while subject to a live 12-month conditional discharge for a previous drug offence. In these circumstances, consideration should have been given to referring the matter back to court in line with policy requirements. Although the offender admitted the offence and was referred to a drug awareness course, their offending history and existing conditional discharge raised questions regarding the suitability of an OoCR. While the intervention sought to address the underlying behaviour, the outcome was not fully aligned with eligibility criteria, providing a useful learning opportunity to support consistent application of OoCR policy in future cases.

CASE 10 - ADULTS

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	For the offence of possession of a Class A drug (Cocaine), the offender was issued with an OoCR and referred to a drug support agency. In the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and consistent with force policy. The intervention provided an opportunity to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour while	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

		supporting rehabilitation and reducing the risk of future offending.	
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender accepted responsibility for their actions and expressed a willingness to engage with support for substance misuse. In the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's circumstances, providing an opportunity to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	This was a state-based offence. The referral to a drug support agency was an appropriate intervention aimed at addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour, supporting rehabilitation, and reducing the likelihood of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case reflects strong, professional, and proportionate decision-making. The offender was dealt with through an OoCR for possession of a Class A drug (Cocaine) and referred to a drug support agency. The offender accepted responsibility for their actions, was willing to engage with substance misuse support, and had no previous offending history. The OoCR was appropriate, consistent with force policy, and focused on addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour. The intervention supported rehabilitation, reduced the risk of future offending, and represented a well-reasoned and proportionate outcome.

CASE 1 - DIVERT

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was referred to the Divert Scheme for possession of an offensive weapon and possession of a Class B drug (Cannabis). Given the absence of any previous offending history and the circumstances of the incident, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and consistent with the principles of diversion and early intervention, providing an opportunity to address the offender's behaviour and reduce the risk of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt,	**Green**	The offender admitted the offences and engaged positively with the Divert	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?		Scheme. In the absence of any previous offending history, the interventions applied were considered appropriate and proportionate, providing a suitable opportunity to address the offending behaviour and reduce the risk of future offending.	
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The interventions delivered through the scheme were considered appropriate and effective in addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour, promoting accountability, and reducing the likelihood of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case demonstrates a proportionate and suitable use of an OoCR. The offender was referred to the Divert Scheme for possession of an offensive weapon and possession of a Class B drug (cannabis). The offender admitted the offences, engaged positively with the scheme, and had no previous offending history. The interventions delivered were appropriate to the circumstances, addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour, promoting accountability, and reducing the risk of future offending through a constructive and rehabilitative approach.

CASE 2 - DIVERT

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was referred to the Divert Scheme for possession of a Class B drug (Cannabis). Given the absence of any previous offending history and the circumstances surrounding the incident, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and justified, providing an opportunity for early intervention and addressing the offending behaviour through a diversionary approach.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence and explained that they used Cannabis to help manage a chronic health condition. In the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's circumstances, providing an opportunity for diversion.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The interventions used were appropriate and proportionate to the circumstances, providing a constructive means of addressing the offending behaviour and reducing the likelihood of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case reflects strong, professional, and proportionate decision-making. The offender was appropriately referred to the Divert Scheme for possession of a Class B drug (Cannabis), with the OoCR supported by the absence of any previous offending history and the circumstances of the offence. The offender admitted the offence and explained that their cannabis use was linked to managing a chronic health condition. The diversionary interventions were appropriate and proportionate, providing an opportunity to address the offending behaviour, support rehabilitation, and reduce the risk of future offending through early intervention.

CASE 3 - DIVERT

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was referred to the Divert Scheme for being the owner or person in charge of a dog that was dangerously out of control. Given the absence of any previous offending history and the circumstances surrounding the incident, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and justified, providing an opportunity for early intervention and education while addressing the offending behaviour.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender demonstrated genuine remorse, was apologetic, and accepted responsibility for their actions. In the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's circumstances, providing an opportunity to address the behaviour through a constructive and preventative approach.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victim supported referral to the Divert Scheme and was satisfied with the outcome. Shuttle mediation was undertaken, and a referral to the Victim Care and Advice Service (VCAS) was made to provide additional support. The	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

		victim's views and wishes were clearly considered throughout the decision-making process. The interventions implemented were appropriate and proportionate, addressing both the impact of the incident and the underlying causes of the offending behaviour while promoting accountability and reducing the risk of future offending.	

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case reflects strong, professional, and proportionate decision-making. The offender was appropriately referred to the Divert Scheme for being the owner or person in charge of a dog that was dangerously out of control. The offender demonstrated genuine remorse, accepted responsibility for their actions, and had no previous offending history, making the OoCR a suitable and justified outcome. The victim supported the use of the scheme and was satisfied with the result, with shuttle mediation and VCAS support helping to address their needs. The interventions applied were appropriate to the circumstances, promoting accountability, addressing the impact of the incident, and reducing the risk of future offending.

CASE 4 - DIVERT

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was referred to the Divert Scheme for being the owner or person in charge of a dog that was dangerously out of control. Given the circumstances of the incident and the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and provided an opportunity for early intervention to address the offending behaviour.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence and accepted responsibility for their actions. In the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's circumstances.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victim was supportive of referral to the Divert Scheme, and their views were appropriately considered as part of the decision-making process. The OoCR and associated interventions were proportionate and sufficient to address the offending	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

		behaviour and reduce the risk of future incidents.	

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case demonstrates well-reasoned and proportionate decision-making. The offender was appropriately referred to the Divert Scheme for being the owner or person in charge of a dog that was dangerously out of control. The offender admitted the offence, accepted responsibility, and had no previous offending history, making the OoCR a suitable and proportionate outcome. The victim supported the use of the scheme, and their views were clearly taken into account. The interventions delivered through the OoCR were appropriate to the circumstances and provided an effective opportunity to address the offending behaviour and reduce the risk of future incidents.

CASE 5 - DIVERT

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was referred to the Divert Scheme for an assault offence. Given the absence of any previous offending history, the circumstances of the incident, and the victim's support for the use of the scheme, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and consistent with the aims of diversion and early intervention.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence. In the absence of any previous offending history, the interventions applied were considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's circumstances, providing a suitable opportunity to address the behaviour and reduce the likelihood of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victim was supportive of the use of the Divert Scheme and was satisfied with the matter being dealt with in this way. Victim Care and Advice Service (VCAS) support was also provided, ensuring the victim's needs and views were appropriately considered throughout the process. Restorative Justice was utilised, and this, alongside the other interventions delivered through the scheme, was considered appropriate in addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour, promoting accountability, and reducing the risk of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case reflects strong, professional, and proportionate decision-making. The offender was appropriately referred to the Divert Scheme for an assault offence, having admitted the offence and with no previous offending history. The victim supported the use of the scheme and received support from VCAS, ensuring their views and needs were fully considered. The use of Restorative Justice and other diversionary interventions provided a constructive and proportionate response, promoting offender accountability, addressing the underlying causes of the offending behaviour, and reducing the risk of future offending.

CASE 1 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was initially referred to the Youth Offending Team (YOT); however, following a failure to engage with the intervention, a youth caution was subsequently issued for possession of drugs. In the circumstances of the case, the use of an OoCR was considered justified, proportionate, and appropriate to the offence.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence at the earliest opportunity and without prompting. In the circumstances of the case, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's circumstances.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	It was considered that the initial referral to the YOT was the most appropriate course of action. However, when the offender failed to engage, the youth caution provided a proportionate and effective response, addressing the offending behaviour while seeking to reduce the likelihood of further offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case demonstrates a proportionate and justified use of an OoCR. The offender was initially referred to the Youth Offending Team but, following a failure to engage, was appropriately issued with a youth caution for possession of drugs. The offender admitted the offence at the earliest opportunity and without prompting, supporting the suitability of the OoCR. The outcome was proportionate to the circumstances, well supported by the offender's situation, and provided an effective response aimed at

	addressing the offending behaviour and reducing the risk of reoffending.

CASE 2 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with a youth conditional caution for one offence of assault and one offence of battery. The case was initially referred to the YOT, however, during engagement with the offender, they admitted one offence but denied the other. Given the absence of a full admission across both offences, a youth conditional caution was subsequently issued. In view of the offender's lack of previous offending history and the circumstances of the incident, the use of an OoCR was considered an appropriate and proportionate response to address the offending behaviour and reduce the likelihood of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted one of the assault offences. Given the absence of any previous offending history and the circumstances of the case, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and supported by the offender's circumstances.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Amber**	The conditions attached to the youth conditional caution were considered appropriate and sufficient to address the offending behaviour and reduce the risk of further offending. However, there was no recorded evidence of the victim's views being obtained or considered as part of the decision-making process, limiting assurance that the victim's perspective was taken into account when determining the outcome.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case demonstrates a proportionate and reasonable use of an OoCR. The offender was issued with a Youth Conditional Caution for assault and battery following referral to the Youth Offending Team. Although the offender admitted only one of the offences, the absence of any previous offending history and the circumstances of the case supported the use of the OoCR. The conditions attached to the caution were appropriate and aimed at addressing the offending behaviour and reducing the risk of

	reoffending. However, there was no recorded evidence that the victim's views had been obtained or considered, limiting assurance that the victim's perspective informed the final outcome.

CASE 3 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with a Youth Caution for common assault. Given the absence of any previous offending history and the circumstances of the offence, the use of an OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and justified. The OoCR provided a suitable opportunity to address the offending behaviour while avoiding unnecessary escalation within the criminal justice system.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender demonstrated remorse for their actions. In the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's circumstances, providing a suitable opportunity to address the offending behaviour and reduce the likelihood of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victim was dissatisfied with the outcome and expressed a wish for the young person to receive a custodial sentence. While the OoCR was considered appropriate in the circumstances, there is no indication that Restorative Justice was explored. Consideration of a restorative approach may have provided an opportunity to address the victim's concerns, enhance their involvement in the process, and promote offender accountability.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments. However, it was explained that while victims' views are an important consideration in the OoCR process, resolutions are victim-focused rather than victim-led. In this case, pursuing a prosecution solely to satisfy the victim's preference would have been disproportionate given the offender's age, circumstances, and the nature of the offence. The OoCR was therefore considered to be the most appropriate and proportionate outcome.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case demonstrates a proportionate and justified use of an OoCR. The offender was issued with a Youth Caution for common assault and, in the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate and well supported by the circumstances of the offence. The offender demonstrated remorse and accepted responsibility, making the intervention a suitable opportunity to address the offending behaviour and reduce the likelihood of further offending. Although the victim was dissatisfied with the outcome and would have preferred a more punitive response, the OoCR process is victim-focused rather than victim-led. Given the offender's age, circumstances, and the nature of the offence, a prosecution would have been disproportionate. While consideration of Restorative Justice may have provided an additional opportunity to address the victim's concerns, the overall outcome was reasonable, proportionate, and consistent with the aims of early intervention and rehabilitation.

CASE 4 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with an OoCR, requiring them to undertake community-based work, for criminal damage to a police vehicle. Given the absence of any previous offending history and the circumstances surrounding the incident, the use of an OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and justified. The OoCR provided an opportunity for the offender to repair some of the harm caused, promote accountability, and address the offending behaviour without unnecessary criminalisation.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence and demonstrated genuine remorse for their actions. In the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's circumstances, providing an opportunity to promote accountability and reduce the risk of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The Force considered that the OoCR was sufficient to address the offending behaviour, providing a proportionate response to the criminal damage caused to the police vehicle. The requirement to undertake	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

		community-based work promoted accountability, encouraged reparation, and addressed the harm resulting from the offence.	

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	This case demonstrates a justified and proportionate use of an OoCR. The offender was dealt with through an OoCR for criminal damage to a police vehicle, with a requirement to undertake community-based work. The offender admitted the offence, demonstrated remorse, and had no previous offending history, making the OoCR appropriate and well supported by the circumstances. The outcome promoted accountability and reparation for the harm caused, while avoiding unnecessary criminalisation. The community-based intervention was considered sufficient to address the offending behaviour and provided a constructive and proportionate response to the offence.

CASE 5 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with an OoCR for possession of a Class B drug (Cannabis). Given the circumstances of the incident and the offender's complex needs, the use of an OoCR was considered both appropriate and proportionate to the offence, providing a balanced response that addressed the offending behaviour while taking account of the individual's vulnerabilities and support needs.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence at the earliest opportunity. The OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's personal circumstances.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	Given the multi-agency support already in place for the young person, the OoCR was considered sufficient to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	The use of an OoCR in this case was proportionate and well-reasoned. The offender admitted possession of a Class B drug (Cannabis) at the earliest opportunity, and consideration was given to both the circumstances of the offence and the offender's complex needs. The OoCR provided a balanced and appropriate response to the offending behaviour while recognising the individual's vulnerabilities and personal circumstances.

	Furthermore, the presence of established multi-agency support for the young person meant that the OoCR was considered sufficient to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour and reduce the likelihood of further offending.

CASE 6 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with an OoCR for a Section 4 Public Order offence. The resolution focused on educational interventions aimed at addressing the behaviour and preventing further offending. Given the circumstances of the incident and the absence of any previous offending history, the use of an OoCR was considered an appropriate, justified, and proportionate response to the offence.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence once further evidence was presented. In light of this admission, and given the absence of any previous offending history, the use of an OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	Given the circumstances of the incident, the OoCR was considered sufficient to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour, providing an appropriate and proportionate intervention.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	The use of an OoCR in this case was lawful, proportionate, and well justified. The offender was issued with an OoCR for a Section 4 Public Order offence, with the resolution focusing on educational interventions designed to address the behaviour and reduce the risk of further offending. Although the offender initially denied the offence, they subsequently admitted it when presented with further evidence. Taking into account the circumstances of the incident, the offender's admission, and the absence of any previous offending history, the OoCR was considered an appropriate and proportionate response.

CASE 7 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS	**Green**	The offender was issued with an OoCR for common assault. Given the circumstances surrounding the incident and the absence of any previous offending history, the use of an	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Code for Crown Prosecutors?		OoCR was considered an appropriate, justified, and proportionate response to the offence.	
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	Given the absence of any previous offending history, the use of an OoCR was considered appropriate, proportionate, and well supported by the offender's personal circumstances, providing a suitable means of addressing the offending behaviour without recourse to formal court proceedings.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victims did not support a prosecution, and their views were clearly considered as part of the decision-making process. Taking account of the victims' wishes and the circumstances of the offence, the OoCR intervention package was considered sufficient to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour and provide an appropriate and proportionate response.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	The use of OoCR in this case was proportionate and appropriately justified. The offender was issued with an OoCR for common assault, with the decision informed by the circumstances of the incident, the offender's lack of previous offending history, and their personal circumstances. The victims did not support a prosecution, and their views were clearly taken into account as part of the decision-making process. In light of these factors, the OoCR and associated intervention package were considered an appropriate and proportionate response, providing a constructive means of addressing the offending behaviour and its underlying causes.

CASE 8 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with an OoCR for common assault. Given the circumstances of the incident, the absence of any previous offending history, and the victim's decision not to support a prosecution, the use of an OoCR was considered an appropriate, justified, and proportionate response to the offence.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence, demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for their actions. Given the absence of any previous	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

this support the decision to use an OoCR?		offending history and taking into account the offender's individual circumstances, the use of an OoCR was considered an appropriate, proportionate, and well-supported means of addressing the offending behaviour.	
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victim did not support a prosecution and provided a negative PNB entry. The victim's views and wishes were clearly considered as part of the decision-making process. In light of the circumstances, the intervention work attached to the OoCR was considered sufficient to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour and reduce the risk of further offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	The use of an OoCR in this case was proportionate and well justified. The offender was issued with an OoCR for common assault, with the decision informed by the circumstances of the incident, the offender's admission of the offence, and the absence of any previous offending history. The victim did not support a prosecution and provided a negative PNB entry, with their views and wishes clearly taken into account as part of the decision-making process. Taking all relevant factors into consideration, the OoCR was considered an appropriate and proportionate response, while the associated intervention work was deemed sufficient to address the underlying causes of the offending behaviour and reduce the likelihood of further offending.

CASE 9 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Green**	The offender was issued with an OoCR for common assault. Given the circumstances of the incident and the absence of any previous offending history, the use of an OoCR was considered an appropriate, justified, and proportionate response to the offence.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The offender admitted the offence and accepted responsibility for their actions. Given the absence of any previous offending history and taking into account the offender's personal circumstances, the use of an OoCR was considered an appropriate, proportionate, and well-supported response to the offending behaviour.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victim's views and wishes were clearly considered as part of the decision-making process. The educational interventions attached to the OoCR were considered sufficient to address the offending behaviour, promote insight and understanding, and reduce the risk of further offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Green	The use of an OoCR in this case was lawful and proportionate. The offender was issued with an OoCR for common assault, with the decision informed by the circumstances of the incident, the offender's admission of the offence and their acceptance of responsibility. Consideration was also given to the absence of any previous offending history and the offender's personal circumstances, supporting the view that an OoCR was an appropriate and proportionate response. The victim's views and wishes were clearly taken into account as part of the decision-making process, and the educational interventions attached to the OoCR were considered sufficient to address the offending behaviour, promote insight and understanding, and reduce the likelihood of future offending.

CASE 10 - YOUNG PEOPLE

Key Questions	RAG Rating	Panel Feedback	Force Response
1. To what extent does the case demonstrate that the use of an OoCR was consistent, suitable, and proportionate in line with Force policy and the CPS Code for Crown Prosecutors?	**Amber**	The offender was issued with an OoCR for a racially aggravated public order offence. However, as the offender resided outside the Force area, the case could not be referred to the local Youth Offending Team (YOT). The Early Intervention Team subsequently advised that they were unable to deliver the required intervention work for an individual residing outside the area. As a result, the young person was referred to children's services. While appropriate safeguarding and support measures were put in place, there remained a need to ensure that the offending behaviour was effectively addressed through the delivery of suitable rehabilitative interventions.	**Action: That the Force explores implementing a reciprocal agreement with neighbouring forces to ensure the effective delivery and monitoring of OoCRs for offenders who reside outside the Force area.** The Force has already begun establishing reciprocal arrangements for adult offenders.

2. How well does the case evidence the offender's admission of guilt, remorse, and relevant offending history, and does this support the decision to use an OoCR?	**Green**	The decision to use an OoCR was appropriate, and the referral to children's services helped ensure that appropriate safeguarding and support measures were put in place. However, because the offender resided outside the Force area, the planned intervention work could not be delivered, reducing the opportunity to address the offending behaviour directly and achieve the intended rehabilitative outcomes of the OoCR.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.
3. To what extent were victim considerations taken into account, and are the conditions or interventions attached to the OoCR sufficient to address the causes of the offending behaviour?	**Green**	The victim was supportive of the police action taken. Although the planned intervention work could not be delivered, the referral to children's services was intended to ensure that appropriate safeguarding and support measures were put in place to address the young person's needs and reduce the risk of future offending.	The Force was in agreement with the Panel's comments.

Overall RAG Rating	Panel Conclusion Summary
Amber	The use of an OoCR in this case was partially effective but highlighted limitations in the delivery of interventions for offenders residing outside the Force area. The offender was issued with an OoCR for a racially aggravated public order offence, and while appropriate safeguarding measures were put in place through a referral to children's services, the Early Intervention Team was unable to deliver rehabilitative work due to the offender living outside the Force boundary. Although the victim was supportive of the police action taken and their views were considered, the absence of targeted intervention work meant that the underlying causes of the offending behaviour were not fully addressed.