

Report 1

It is alleged that [REDACTED] has, been subjected to persecution and discrimination by Northumbria Police because of her status as a transgender person.

Northumbria Police's stated policy commits it to eliminating discrimination. Individual police officers have a positive duty to avoid discriminating unlawfully or unfairly.

In order to address this allegation, the Investigator identified 11 occasions on which [REDACTED] had contact with Northumbria Police in the period [REDACTED]. As [REDACTED] interacted with Northumbria Police officers, she could potentially have been treated differently due to her transgender status. A proportionate investigation has been undertaken into each of these incidents to establish how [REDACTED] was treated. It has been found that there is no evidence that [REDACTED] was disadvantaged or treated differently due to her transgender status.

Having a protected characteristic (in this case transgender) is not in itself sufficient to prove that there has been bias. In order to demonstrate discrimination, the Investigator would expect to see some evidence that [REDACTED] was treated differently by the police, which was to her detriment and was due to her being transgender. No such evidence has been found.

The Investigator's opinion is that the complaint is **not upheld**.

Report 2

You allege that you felt PC [REDACTED] was indirectly homophobic towards you by assuming you were the offender and refused to take an account from you.

PC [REDACTED] states that at no point did he make assumptions about the identity of the offender. PC [REDACTED] reports that he spoke to all parties at the address including your [REDACTED] and yourself. He states that you accepted at the time that you had caused your [REDACTED] injury whilst trying to enter her room.

PC [REDACTED] states he treated you as a suspect on these facts alone and exhibited no homophobia at the time of the incident or afterwards. PC [REDACTED] confirms no party present raised any issue of homophobia or other discrimination at the time of the incident.

I have listened to the call and the information you passed at that time did not amount to a criminal offence against you, nor did you allege that your partner, on whose behalf you were making the report, had been the victim of an offence.

It is apparent from the information available that [REDACTED] identified you as the primary perpetrator in this incident on the basis that [REDACTED] named you as responsible. In view of this and, in the absence of any criminal allegation made by you during your call I agree with this decision on the facts available.

As your [REDACTED] did not wish to pursue a prosecution, you were not interviewed, which would have been the case if you had been arrested or interviewed as a voluntary attender.

The officer reports that at no time did he assume anything as to who the offender was and acted upon information passed only.

The officer has no previous complaints of discrimination and no patterns of behaviour have been identified.

You do not describe any discriminatory language and did not bring this to the officer's attention at the time.

While I am aware that the situation has caused you to feel let down, I am satisfied that there is no evidence of discrimination and that the officer would have treated a person who does not have protected characteristics in the same situation in the same way.

In light of the above I conclude that, on the balance of probabilities that this complaint is **not upheld**.

Report 3

You alleged that the custody sergeant on duty, Sgt [REDACTED] made derogatory references to your sexuality via hand gestures. You further state that she was on duty during your last arrest and allege that she planted a pair of pink socks in your item bag. You feel that the actions of the officer suggest he is gay which you state is false and slanderous.

You state that on the morning of the [REDACTED] Sgt [REDACTED] introduced herself. Then said 'Hi [REDACTED]' which you didn't think was very professional. You asked to be addressed as Mr [REDACTED]. This was followed by a dropping of the right wrist as a 'probable gay' and lastly a 'thumbs up', most probably for 'diversity' logo.

You state that this officer was on duty the day you were arrested when a pair of pink socks were placed in your property bag but you were wearing grey when you came into custody.

Sgt [REDACTED] denies the accusations completely. Sgt [REDACTED] had very little to do with you that morning as you left custody at 8:18am just over an hour after Sgt [REDACTED] had started work. The custody record shows the following entries from Sgt [REDACTED]

DP awake sitting up responding well to all questions asked, states he is fit and well.

CCTV for the [REDACTED] from the custody suite has been viewed and shows that no comments of this nature were made, no hand gestures were made and no interference with your property bag was made.

The custody record shows that the property seal number was the same that was used to seal your property when you were searched upon arrival in custody.

In view of this, on the balance of probabilities I conclude that this complaint is **not upheld.**