Police and Crime Panel for Lancashire 8th July 2013

Summary of Complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner for Lancashire up to May 2013

Ref	Complaint	Position
COM1	Alleged irregularities concerning expenses that were claimed by Mr Grunshaw, the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) while he was a member of Lancashire County Council and the Lancashire Police Authority.	The PCC made a statement in relation to the complaint at the Panel in December 2012. In view of the nature of the complaint it has been forwarded to the IPCC for further investigation. The Secretary to the Panel will continue to liaise with the IPCC and will update the Panel on developments.
COM2	Alleged involvement of the PCC in 'operational matters' regarding the investigation of a previous complaint in relation to the Chief Constable and the Chief Executive of the Office of the PCC.	The Secretary considered the complaint to be both vexatious and an abuse of process within the meaning of Regulation 15(e) of the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012. No further action has been taken and the complainant has been informed in writing of the decision.
СОМЗ	Complainant made two complaints about the conduct of the Chief Constable. The Chief Executive of the OPCC was asked to deal with these issues and advised complainant that no action would be taken in relation to either complaint and that her decision in relation to the second complaint was on the basis that she considered the allegations to be repetitious.	The Secretary considers the complaint against the PCC is vexatious and an abuse of the procedures for dealing with complaints within the meaning of Regulation 15(e) of the 2012 Regulations. Furthermore, even if the complaint against the PCC Chief Executive could be regarded as a separate issue (which is not considered to be the case) that complaint relates solely to the conduct of a person working as a member of the PCC's staff within the meaning of Regulation 15(3)(a).

Complainant considers that PCC Chief Executive is suppressing the complaint as she has not specified the grounds upon which she has reached her conclusion that the allegations were repetitious. Complainant is dissatisfied with the explanation given by the Standards and Governance Officer in the OPCC which is considered to be inadequate.

Complaint against the PCC is that he has not instructed the PCC Chief Executive to clarify why she reached her decision that the original complaint was repetitious

No further action has been taken and the complainant has been informed in writing of the decision