

THE INITIAL REASON FOR THE PURSUIT WAS FAIL TO STOP. THE SUBJECT VEHICLE WAS IDENTIFIED AS STOLEN WITH KEYS.

THE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO MET CC FROM THE PURSUIT VEHICLE WAS NOT ADEQUATE AT ALL TIMES AS KEY INFORMATION SUCH AS CHANGE IN ROAD SURFACE, PRESENCE OF PEDESTRIANS, USE OF BRAKE LIGHTS AND THE MANNER OF DRIVING BY THE SUBJECT VEHICLE WAS NOT MENTIONED.

ACCORDING TO THE EVIDENCE GIVEN BY EXPERT WITNESSES THE DRIVING BY THE SUBJECT VEHICLE WAS DANGEROUS.

THE 'POLICE DRIVER AND VEHICLE POLICY (pursuits)' WHICH COVERS PROPORTIONALITY AND THE PRINCIPLE OF 'LEAST INTRUSION' IS PART OF FORMAL DRIVING TRAINING.

'ANNEX A' OF THE CHANGES TO MPS PURSUIT POLICY' IS AN AID TO ASSIST DYNAMIC RISK ASSESSMENT (DRA).

THIS AID WAS PUBLISHED VIA EMAIL/INTRANET WHICH SEEMS INSUFFICIENT FOR SUCH A KEY CHANGE.

THE ONGOING RISK ASSESSMENT BY DRIVER AND/OR OPERATOR WAS INAPPROPRIATE UNDER THIS POLICY.

IT IS NOT DEFINED IN THE POLICY AS TO WHO SHOULD GIVE THE DRA BASED ON THE RELATIVE EXPERIENCE LEVEL OF BOTH DRIVER AND OPERATOR.

EXPERT EVIDENCE SUGGESTS THAT THE DRA GIVEN SHOULD COVER THE HIGHEST RISK ATTAINED WITHIN A SPECIFIED TIME.

THE PURSUIT SHOULD NOT HAVE CONTINUED THROUGHOUT BECAUSE THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE CRIME WAS RELATIVELY LOW COMPARED TO THE ONGOING RISK TO THE PUBLIC.

THE SUPERVISION OF THE PURSUIT WAS NOT ADEQUATE AS THE INFORMATION SUPPLIED WAS SUFFICIENT TO HAVE COME TO A CONCLUSION THAT THE RISK WAS HIGH AND SO THE PURSUIT COULD HAVE BEEN TERMINATED GIVEN THE LOCATION.

IN ADDITION, IF THE NPC SYSTEM HAD INDICATED ON THE STOLEN CAR REPORT WHETHER A PREVIOUS HIGH RISK PURSUIT HAD OCCURED THEN THIS PURSUIT MAY NOT HAVE STARTED.

THE SINGLE INPUT CHANNEL DID NOT ALLOW  
THE KEY MESSAGES TO BE PRIORITISED.  
THIS LED TO DELAYS IN RISK ASSESSMENT AND  
TERMINATION DECISION.

---