



# Use of Force Analysis Report

**1<sup>st</sup> July – 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019 – Q3**

# 1

## ■ Use of Force Submissions



### Q3 2019


Total number of incidents: **39,984**

Number of uses of force recorded: **415**

**1%** of incidents involved use of force

**28** Officers injured, **17** Officers intentionally assaulted

Number of Use of Force submissions



# 2

## Officers role and locations



### Officers main role during incident

Officer Role	Q4 2018	Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019
Mobile patrol	211	274	270	<b>310</b>
Custody	10	24	38	<b>37</b>
ARV	15	12	14	<b>11</b>
Other	9	22	13	<b>11</b>
Foot patrol	3	5	13	<b>13</b>
Dog Handler Duty	-	-	11	<b>28</b>
CID	1	-	3	<b>1</b>
Roads policing	2	7	2	<b>4</b>
PSU/public order	-	1	1	-
Off duty	1	4	-	-


### Location setting for UoF

Location	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3 2019
Street / Highway	142	162	180	<b>215</b>
Dwelling	69	89	90	<b>110</b>
Custody block	22	48	60	<b>67</b>
Open ground	15	12	35	<b>22</b>
Police vehicle	19	21	22	<b>18</b>
Hospital	6	18	16	<b>14</b>
Retail premises	11	15	11	<b>9</b>
Mental health setting	4	15	8	<b>2</b>
Other	10	12	8	<b>12</b>
Licensed premises	1	10	8	<b>18</b>
Sports or event	-	2	1	-
Police station	-	2	1	<b>1</b>
Ambulance	1	1	1	<b>1</b>
Public transport	1	1	-	-

# 3 Who




## Perceived Gender



Transgender: 1 (0.2%)


## Perceived Ethnicity



- White 87%
- Black (or Black British) 8%
- Mixed 2%
- Asian (or Asian British) 1%
- Other 1%
- Don't know 1%

## Perceived Age

Perceived age of subject	Q4 2018	Q1	Q2	Q3 2019	% for Q3
0 – 10	3	8	29	<b>18</b>	4.3%
11 – 17	16	49	41	<b>33</b>	8%
18 – 34	153	172	159	<b>209</b>	50.4%
35 – 49	57	88	89	<b>100</b>	24.1%
50 – 64	23	21	34	<b>41</b>	9.9%
65+	-	5	2	<b>2</b>	0.5%




\*Subject perceived as disabled

# 4 ■ Why



## Reason officer used force\*



## Contributing factors Q3 2019\*

Factor	Total	%
Alcohol	185	44.6
Mental Health	136	32.8
Size/Gender/Build	112	27
Drugs	120	28.9
Prior knowledge	87	21
Possession of a weapon	63	15.2
Other	56	13.5
Crowd	22	5.3
Acute behavioural disorder	7	1.7

\* Multiple reasons can be recorded for each use of force incident

# 5 ■ How



Tactic	Q4 2018	Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019
Tactical communication	244	331	340	<b>387</b>
Compliant Handcuffing	138	175	177	<b>203</b>
Unarmed skills	65	122	142	<b>132</b>
Non-compliant Handcuffing	83	120	129	<b>148</b>
Ground Restraint	76	99	122	<b>136</b>
Limb / Body restraints	20	29	32	<b>35</b>
C.E.D. (Taser) all deployments	23	28	26	<b>36</b>
Other / improvised	7	17	17	<b>8</b>
Irritant spray - PAVA drawn	6	4	12	<b>8</b>
Irritant spray - PAVA used	8	4	10	<b>15</b>
Spit guard	8	17	9	<b>10</b>
Dog deployed	0	0	7	<b>16</b>
AEP aimed	1	6	6	<b>6</b>
Baton drawn	2	7	5	<b>2</b>
Shield	0	6	4	<b>5</b>
Baton used	2	3	4	<b>3</b>
Firearms	3	2	2	<b>4</b>
Irritant spray - CS drawn	0	0	1	<b>5</b>
Dog Bite	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
Irritant spray - CS used	0	1	1	<b>1</b>
AEP fired	0	1	0	<b>1</b>

# 6 ■ Taser analysis



Tactic	Q4 2018	Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019
C.E.D. (Taser) all deployments	23	28	26	<b>36</b>

	Red Dot	Drawn	Aimed	Fired	Arced	Drive Stun	Angle Drive Stun
Q3	25	18	19	12	5	0	0
Q4	23	21	17	6	0	1	0
Q1	23	13	11	5	1	0	0
Q2	10	7	4	4	4	0	0
Q3 2019	19	8	8	10	1	0	0

