

IPCC report into the contact between Fiona
Pilkington and Leicestershire Constabulary
2004-2007

Independent Investigation
Final Report

IPCC Reference: 2009/016872

Table of contents

Introduction	5
Terms of Reference	5
Complaints	6
Subjects to the investigation	6
Principal Beat Officers (PBOs)	7
Sergeants	10
Inspectors	13
Officer responses	14
Investigation Review	19
Team Structure 2004 to 2007	19
Background Information	22
Chronological summary of events	24
Outline of contact between the Pilkington family and Leicestershire Police between 9 January 2004 and 4 October 2007	25
Comprehensive Summary of contact between Fiona Pilkington and Leicestershire Constabulary between 9 January 2004 and 4 October 2007	29
2004	29
2005	61
2006	66
2007	68
Statements	101
Mrs. Pamela Cassell	101
'A Local Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator'	102
Chairman of Barwell Parish Council	104
A 'Local Resident'	104
A 'Neighbour' of Fiona Pilkington	105
Police Profile of Bardon Road and Barwell	105
Problem Solving Plans	107
Multi Agency Approach	109
Legislation	114
Leicestershire Constabulary Policies and Procedures – 2004 to 2007	116
Leicestershire Constabulary Anti Social Behaviour 'Incremental Approach' Policy	116
Leicestershire Constabulary Anti Social Behaviour Orders Policy and Protocol	118
Leicestershire Constabulary Anti Social Behaviour Officer	118
Leicestershire Constabulary Police Procedures for Dealing with Hate Crime / Incidents	121
Leicestershire Constabulary Hate Crime Officers	123
Leicestershire Constabulary Community Engagement and Consultation Strategy	126
Leicestershire Constabulary Crime Reduction and Community Safety	127

Leicestershire Constabulary Vulnerable and Intimidated Witnesses and Victims Policy	128
Leicestershire Constabulary Information Exchange Protocol	128
Between Leicestershire Constabulary and Harborough District Council for Anti Social Behaviour, Graffiti, Litter and other associated Crimes	128
An Information Sharing Protocol between Leicestershire Constabulary and Victim Support Leicestershire and Rutland	129
Leicestershire Constabulary No Secrets - The Protection of Vulnerable Adults (Multi Agency Policy and Procedures)	129
Leicestershire Constabulary Guidelines for Installation and Withdrawal of Domestic Violence, Hate Attack and Autodialler Alarms	130
Leicestershire Constabulary Systems and Databases	131
OIS.....	131
INSIGHT	134
CIS.....	135
GENIE	137
Use of Systems and Databases by Officers.....	138
Officers Knowledge of the Pilkington Family	141
Supervision.....	144
Communication	149
Misconduct Considerations	153
PC 'A'	153
PC 'B'	157
PC 'C'	159
PC 'D'	161
PS 'E'	163
PS 'F'	165
PS 'G'	167
PS 'H'	168
APS 'I'	169
Inspector 'J'	169
Inspector 'K'	170
Inspector 'L'	171
Changes made by Leicestershire Constabulary	172
Systems and Databases	172
Identifying Vulnerability	173
Call Management Centre	175
Mobile Data Terminals	176
Multi Agency Working	176
Leicestershire Constabulary Policies.....	177
Supervision.....	178
Recommendations.....	178
Conclusions.....	179
Addendum (2 March 2011)	181

Introduction

1. This report examines the response given by Leicestershire Constabulary to Fiona Pilkington and her family following their reporting of anti social behaviour during the period January 2004 and October 2007.
2. Between 17 and 28 September 2009 an inquest into the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and her daughter Francecca was heard before Assistant Deputy Coroner Ms Olivia Davison at Loughborough Town Hall.
3. As a result of the inquest, the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) made a communication to Leicestershire Constabulary regarding the case and on 18 September 2009 Leicestershire Constabulary referred the case to the IPCC who determined that the matter would be investigated independently.

Terms of Reference

4. Below is an extract from the Terms of Reference:
 - To investigate the circumstances surrounding the police contact with the Pilkington family prior to the death of Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick. In particular:
 - a) To consider and review the report produced by Leicestershire Constabulary Operation Teak and the evidence given to HM Coroner in the inquest into their deaths. Once considered, the investigation will decide on the issues that require further investigation.
 - b) When drawing conclusions and making recommendations the investigation will consider the nature and history of all the complaints made by or on behalf of Fiona Pilkington and the police response; having regard to any relevant national and local

- police policies and guidelines.
- c) The investigation will consider and comment upon any specific organisational matters that may have impacted upon the police response and given the passage of time, any improvements to systems that may have been introduced since the deaths.
 - d) The investigation will consider any multi agency opportunities that may have been available to the police at the time and whether or not they were properly utilised.
 - e) The investigation will consider and deal appropriately with any criminal or disciplinary matters identified.
5. The terms of reference were agreed by IPCC Commissioner Amerdeep Somal on 25 September 2009.

Complaints

6. No complaint has been made with regard to this investigation.

Subjects to the investigation

7. Following a review of the documentation provided by Leicestershire Constabulary and that obtained by the IPCC a decision was made on 19 November 2009 that the IPCC investigation would focus on calls made to the police between 9 January 2004 and 4 October 2007.
8. In light of the above review the investigation became subject of 'Special Requirements', a severity assessment was carried out and analysis of the documents led to a rationale being decided upon regarding which officers to consider for the serving of Regulation 14a Notices, as a large number of officers had encountered some level of contact with Fiona Pilkington and her family.
9. All the officers identified were served with Regulation 14a Notices in line with Regulation 14a Police (Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.
10. Those served with notices were identified as officers whose conduct

may have fallen below the standards expected and they had all been involved at some stage with the Pilkington family and / or based on their role, they either were or should have been aware of a number of incidents and the problems being encountered.

11. Twelve Regulation 14a Notices were served in total to;
 - Four PCs who had responsibility for the Barwell area in their role of Principal Beat Officer. The role of a Principal Beat Officer is to interact with the community in their designated 'beat' area and deal with community issues such as anti social behaviour.
 - Five Sergeants whose role included responsibility for the area of Barwell and / or supervisory responsibility for Barwell Principal Beat Officers.
 - Three Inspectors who had overall command responsibility for an area that included Barwell and supervisory responsibility for the Sergeants mentioned above.
12. Whilst there is evidence that some action was taken, there is also evidence these officers were or should have been aware of a range of incidents and overall their approach failed to instigate effective measures to support the Pilkington family.

Principal Beat Officers (PBOs)

13. The general allegation made to the four Principal Beat Officers (PBOs) was as follows:
14. Prior to the death of Fiona Pilkington and Francessca Hardwick you were an assigned Principal Beat Officer with responsibility for an area of Barwell that included Bardon Road. You are recorded as having attended 59 Bardon Road or being made aware of incidents at Bardon Road. As the PBO you must have been aware of the levels of anti social behaviour in and around Bardon Road that were being committed by an identified group of youths. Despite the high level of anti social behaviour there was no evidence of effective action being

taken to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington.

15. This is highlighted by the following incidents:

PC 'A'

16. On 11 June 2004 following a call from Mrs. Cassell reporting anti social behaviour by local youths, the incident was closed detailing that PC 'A' would discuss anti social behaviour with PS 'E'.
17. On 22 June 2004 a report was made by Fiona Pilkington that concerned anti social behaviour and bullying of her son, within which she stated that she had previously dealt with PC 'A'. The incident was closed as details to PBO.
18. On 25 June 2004 a further report by Fiona Pilkington was made reporting bullying and anti social behaviour within which she stated she was happy for the PBO PC 'A' to be made aware.
19. On 13 February 2007 a request was made by Fiona Pilkington for officers to attend and assist in moving on youths who were shouting and screaming. The incident was linked to an earlier call reporting youths harassing a 76 year old woman also on Bardon Road. The incident was closed for PC 'A' to complete enquiries.
20. On 28 March 2007, following a complaint made by Fiona Pilkington to David Tredinnick MP, PC 'A' emailed [REDACTED] to say he had visited Fiona Pilkington at her home address and he had contacted Mr. 'HBBC3' at Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
21. On 6 April 2007 a call was made by Fiona Pilkington on behalf of her son reporting constant bullying of him by named youths. She stated this to be an ongoing problem being dealt with by PC 'A'.
22. On 2 June 2007 a report of anti social behaviour was made by Fiona Pilkington that stated PC 'A' was aware of the situation.
23. From Leicestershire Constabulary OIS messages it was clear that a number of incidents were closed by stating 'PBO aware' or 'incident

faxed to PBO'.

PC 'B'

24. Following a call from Mrs. Cassell reporting her grandson had been locked in a shed by two boys (OIS 932 of 3 July 2004), PC 'B' attended 59 Bardon Road, Barwell.
25. It is believed PC 'B' was also made aware of a written complaint to Leicestershire Constabulary by Fiona Pilkington, made prior to the above reported incident, and PC 'B' subsequently submitted a report to Inspector 'J' (dated 19 July 2004).
26. On 7 July 2004 PC 'B' took a witness statement from Fiona Pilkington which detailed allegations of historic incidents of anti social behaviour by named perpetrators. He also printed a number of OIS incidents relating to 59 Bardon Road on the same day.
27. On 13 July 2004 a video interview of Mrs. Cassell's grandson (Fiona Pilkington's son) took place which was monitored by PC 'B' during which Fiona Pilkington's son stated he believed he was 'going to be killed'. The subsequent crime report (WH/04049/04-0) detailed PC 'B's' actions but failed to reflect the seriousness of the incident; which was filed as 'undetected'.
28. Despite the level of information that was available to PC 'B', it is alleged that he took insufficient action to effectively deal with the seriousness of the incident, as reported to him by Fiona Pilkington's son during his interview, and also to assist Fiona Pilkington and her family in dealing with the reported anti social behaviour incidents.

PC 'C'

29. On 28 October 2005 where an incident of anti social behaviour was reported by Fiona Pilkington, the incident log showed that PC 'C' was assigned to deal with the report. There is no record of any action taken.
30. On 3 November 2005 a further incident of anti social behaviour reported by Fiona Pilkington, similar to the incident on 28 October

2005, was printed for PC 'C' to deal with. There is no record of any action taken.

31. On 3 July 2007 following a report of harassment by Fiona Pilkington the incident log was closed with PC 'C' stating the matter was in hand.
32. From Leicestershire Constabulary OIS messages it was clear that a number of incidents were closed by stating 'PBO aware' or 'incident faxed to PBO'.

PC 'D'

33. On 28 July 2004 following a report of an assault on Fiona Pilkington's son, PC 'D' detailed a negative statement was taken and a Harassment Warning was given to youths.
34. On 1 February 2007 a report was made of anti social behaviour which occurred where no police resources were sent at the time but PC 'D' printed the incident on 5 February 2007.
35. On 6 April 2007 following an incident of stone throwing at Fiona Pilkington's son, the incident was closed detailing PC 'D' was going to send a statement to Mr 'HBBC3' of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to get Anti Social Behaviour warning letters issued. PC 'D' did not submit that statement.
36. On 2 June 2007 a report was made of anti social behaviour by Fiona Pilkington concerning local youths. The incident was closed detailing PC 'D' to deal.
37. From Leicestershire Constabulary OIS messages it was clear a number of incidents were closed by stating 'PBO aware' or 'incident faxed to PBO'.

Sergeants

38. The following allegation was made to the five Sergeants as follows:
39. It is clear from Leicestershire Constabulary records that a number of reports of both crime and anti social behaviour were made by residents

of Bardon Road. From these records it can be seen officers from the Neighbourhood Beat Team attended incidents in Bardon Road including those reported by Fiona Pilkington and her family.

40. Despite the high level of anti social behaviour there was no evidence of effective action being taken to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington.
41. In addition to this, specific allegations were made to individual Sergeants as follows:

PS 'E'

42. PS 'E' was the PBO Team/Problem Solving/Neighbourhood Action Sergeant during 2004 to 2007 with responsibility for dealing with reported crime and anti social behaviour in the area of Bardon Road, Barwell.
43. Aside from the overriding responsibility for dealing with anti social behaviour within Barwell, PS 'E' was aware of the Pilkington family concerns and the issues surrounding anti social behaviour in the Bardon Road area as he named in Incident Log 872 (see below).
44. Incident Log 872 of 11 June 2004 relates to a report by Mrs. Cassell of ongoing anti social behaviour in Bardon Road. This incident was attended by PC 'A' and written off stating he would liaise with PS 'E' regarding the anti social behaviour.

PS 'F'

45. PS 'F' was the Citizen Focus/Neighbourhood Sergeant in 2007 with responsibility for supervising PBOs and for dealing with reported crime and anti social behaviour in the area of Bardon Road, Barwell.
46. Aside from the overriding responsibility for dealing with anti social behaviour within Barwell as the Citizen Focus/Neighbourhood Beat Team Sergeant, PS 'F' attended WIST meetings with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and other agencies which, amongst other things, was set up to deal with reports of anti social behaviour.

PS 'G'

47. PS 'G' was the Beat Team/Citizen Focus Sergeant during 2007 with responsibility for supervising local officers and for dealing with reported crime and anti social behaviour in the area of Bardon Road, Barwell.
48. As the Beat Team/Citizen Focus Sergeant , aside from the overriding responsibility for dealing with anti social behaviour within Barwell, PS 'G' was aware of the Pilkington family concerns and the issues surrounding anti social behaviour in the Bardon Road area as he was mentioned in the below listed documents:
49. Crime report SH/04050/07-0 related to assault and harassment at ■■■■■ Bardon Road which named individuals responsible who were the same as those responsible for harassing the Pilkington family.
50. Crime report SH/03939/07-6 related to criminal damage at the address of Fiona Pilkington which clearly detailed Fiona Pilkington and her family were suffering from ongoing anti social behaviour.
51. The Problem Solving Plan dated February 2007 for the Earl Shilton and Barwell areas, submitted by PC 'D', clearly indicated PS 'G' took over responsibility in the area of anti social behaviour outlined within the document. The document showed those responsible were from an identifiable group migrating from the Barwell area.

PS 'H'

52. PS 'H' was the Beat Team/Neighbourhood Action/Problem Solving Sergeant during 2006 to 2007 with responsibility for supervising PBO's and for dealing with reported crime and anti social behaviour in the area of Bardon Road, Barwell.
53. As the Beat Team/Neighbourhood Action/Problem Solving Sergeant PS 'H' had direct line responsibility for officers within the beat team for Barwell and had the overriding responsibility for dealing with anti social behaviour within Barwell.
54. The Problem Solving Plan dated February 2007 for the Earl Shilton and

Barwell areas, submitted by PC 'D', clearly indicated PS 'H' took over responsibility in the area of anti social behaviour outlined within the document. The document showed those responsible were from an identifiable group migrating from the Barwell area.

Acting PS 'I'

55. It is alleged APS 'I' was the Shift Sergeant during some of 2007 with the neighbourhood responsibility for Barwell and for dealing with reported crime and anti social behaviour in the area of Bardon Road, Barwell.
56. As the Shift Sergeant APS 'I' had the overriding responsibility for dealing with anti social behaviour within Barwell.

Inspectors

57. The allegation below was made to all three Inspectors:

Inspector 'J'

Inspector 'K'

Inspector 'L'

58. They were the LPU Commanders between 2004 and 2007 with responsibility for dealing with reported crime and anti social behaviour in the area of Bardon Road, Barwell. It was clear from Leicestershire Constabulary records that a number of reports of both crime and anti social behaviour were made by residents of Bardon Road. From these records it could be seen officers from their Local Policing Unit beat team attended incidents in Bardon Road including those reported by Fiona Pilkington and her family.
59. Despite the high level of anti social behaviour there was no evidence of effective action being taken to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington.

Officer responses

60. All twelve officers were interviewed under tape recorded conditions by IPCC investigators at the IPCC office in Coalville, Leicestershire and all officers cooperated fully with the investigation.
61. The complexity of the supervision structure was commented on during the interviews of the majority of officers. This was made all the more confusing by there often being more than one name for the same role over the relevant period. To aid understanding, please refer to the explanation of the management structure at paragraph 104.
62. When the IPCC investigation began Leicestershire Constabulary were asked to provide a list of those supervisory officers responsible for the Bardon Road area in order that an informed decision could be made regarding any misconduct issues.
63. The list provided contained 62 names as Leicestershire Constabulary could not identify or establish the officers who were immediately responsible for either line management or, as defined by their role, for the relevant time period and/or area. It was also pointed out by some officers the information contained within this list was inaccurate.
64. The response to the allegations given by each officer will be covered in more detail later in this report however, clarification of their individual roles during the relevant time was given as follows:

PC 'A'

65. PC 'A' did not provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 25 February 2010.
66. During interview PC 'A' confirmed he was a PBO for the Barwell beat from February 2004 [REDACTED]. He said initially Barwell was one beat but it later merged with Earl Shilton.

PC 'B'

67. PC 'B' was initially treated as a witness to the investigation but was

served with a Regulation 14a Notice when further evidence was found during the course of the investigation.

68. PC 'B' did not provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 28 May 2010.
69. PC 'B' was the PBO for the Barwell beat between 16 September 2003 and 30 August 2004 although he was only 'active' as a PBO between 2 June 2004 and 30 August 2004 due to periods of long term sickness and restricted duties.

PC 'C'

70. PC 'C' [REDACTED] did not provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 28 January 2010.
71. During interview PC 'C' confirmed he was a PBO for the Barwell beat between 2005 and 2008, however he could not be more specific on the dates. He also said he started as a PBO for the Barwell beat but at some point this merged with Earl Shilton and although the PBOs tried to work their own beat area (either Barwell or Earl Shilton), when on duty they covered the merged beat area.

PC 'D'

72. PC 'D' [REDACTED] did not provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 26 January 2010.
73. During interview PC 'D' confirmed in July 2004 he was still a probationer and was a General Duties Officer (GDO) based at Hinckley. This role entailed responding to incidents across the Hinckley area as and when they came in.
74. PC 'D' confirmed he became a PBO for the Earl Shilton and Barwell beat in December 2005 until October 2007. He explained the beat was split down the middle regarding responsibilities but technically it was still one beat. He said he was one of two PBOs for Earl Shilton and for Barwell it was PBO PC 'C' and PBO PC 'A'.

PS 'E'

75. PS 'E' did provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 19 March 2010.
76. During interview PS 'E' said he was the PBO / Problem Solving Team Sergeant from March 2004 until September 2004. He explained this role included responsibility for the PBOs in several areas of Hinckley, including Barwell, and he offered PBOs support and direction in the day to day running of their beats.
77. PS 'E' stated in September 2006 he was asked by Inspector 'K' to return to the area and undertake a similar role to before, which again included supervision of the PBOs. He explained this was to give some stability to the beat teams as there were a lot of internal changes taking place which would be implemented in April 2007 and would affect the supervision of the PBOs from that date.
78. PS 'E' clarified he had more direct line management responsibility for PBOs during the 2004 period.
79. His role title from September 2006 was Neighbourhood Action Sergeant which PS 'E' explained was essentially the same as the Problem Solving Team / PBO Sergeant role he had in 2004 but given a different name. He remained in this position until June 2007.

PS 'F'

80. PS 'F' did provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 23 March 2010.
81. During interview and in his written response PS 'F' stated he was the Citizen Focus Sergeant from 1 April 2007 and this role included supervision of Neighbourhood Policing for the whole of Hinckley and Bosworth, supporting all PBOs and chairing the Weekly Information Sharing Taskforce (WIST) meetings (WIST meetings and their relevance will be covered in more detail later in this report).
82. PS 'F' stated according to Human Resources records he became the

Neighbourhood Priority Beat Sergeant for Earl Shilton and Barwell from 6 August 2007 until November 2009. PS 'F' explained the Barwell and Earl Shilton beat was given 'priority' status some time in 2007 but he believed this was not until after the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francessca Hardwick.

PS 'G'

83. PS 'G' [REDACTED] did provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 20 April 2010.
84. During interview PS 'G' stated he was a Shift Sergeant at Hinckley from 8 January 2007 with responsibility for a number of General Duties Officers (GDO's) – not PBO's.
85. He explained from 1 April 2007 his title changed to that of Neighbourhood Team Leader and he, together with one other Sergeant, was given the neighbourhood responsibility for the geographical area of Barwell and Earl Shilton.
86. PS 'G' clarified he now had line management responsibilities for both General Duties Officers (GDOs) *and* the PBOs that were aligned to his shift however, this did not necessarily include the PBOs also responsible for the Barwell and Earl Shilton area (please refer to paragraph 104).
87. He remained in this role until December 2007 when he became Citizen Focus Sergeant. He confirmed he had never been a 'Beat Team' Sergeant.

PS 'H'

88. PS 'H' [REDACTED] did provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 17 March 2010.
89. During interview PS 'H' explained he was responsible for the Barwell area for a short period in 2007, but not in any of the three roles stated on his Regulation 14a Notice.
90. PS 'H' explained he became a Neighbourhood Team Leader (also

known as a Shift Sergeant) alongside PS 'G' with responsibility for Earl Shilton and Barwell on 1 April 2007, but did not effectively undertake this role until 28 May 2007 due to training and annual leave commitments. He remained in this role until 16 July 2007.

91. PS 'H' said in this role he had line management responsibilities for both General Duties Officers and PBOs aligned to his shift however, like PS 'G', this did not necessarily include the PBOs also responsible for the Barwell and Earl Shilton area.

APS 'I'

92. APS 'I' (now PC 'I') did provide a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 4 June 2010.
93. PC 'I' is now a serving officer with [REDACTED] (another Police Force) but during interview he stated between April 2007 and July 2007 he was a Neighbourhood Team Leader with geographical responsibility for the area of Burbage and during this time had line management responsibility for Earl Shilton PBO PC 'D'.
94. He also stated in July 2007 he changed onto a different shift, taking over from PS 'H', to become a Neighbourhood Team Leader with geographical responsibility for the Barwell and Earl Shilton area, this included responsibility for PBO PC 'C'. He remained in this role until January 2008.

Inspector 'J'

95. Inspector 'J' [REDACTED] provided a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 22 April 2010.
96. In his written response and during interview Inspector 'J' confirmed he was the Local Policing Unit Commander for Hinckley and Bosworth between 3 May 2004 and 3 October 2005. This area included Barwell.

Inspector 'K'

97. Inspector 'K' provided a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice.

He was interviewed on 26 April 2010.

98. In his written response and during interview Inspector 'K' confirmed he was the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Policing Unit Commander between 10 October 2005 and 10 July 2007. This area included Barwell.
99. He explained in April 2007, during his tenure as LPU Commander, Leicestershire Constabulary restructured the boundaries of its Borough Command Areas and reduced them from four Borough Command Areas to three. The effect of these changes is explained in more detail below (please refer to paragraph 104).

Inspector 'L'

100. Inspector 'L' [REDACTED] provided a written response to his Regulation 14a Notice. He was interviewed on 27 April 2010.
101. In his written response and during interview Inspector 'L' confirmed he was the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Policing Unit Commander between 9 July 2007 and July 2009. This area included Barwell.

Investigation Review

102. Initially the Regulation 14a Notices were served for 'Gross Misconduct', however following a further severity assessment and review of the investigation in April 2010, new notices were served advising all officers that the severity assessment had been re-determined to 'Misconduct', including at this stage the first service of Regulation 14a Notices on APS 'I' and PC 'B'.
103. The Regulation 14a Notice for Inspector 'L' was withdrawn on 29 October 2010.

Team Structure 2004 to 2007

104. The time span of contact between Fiona Pilkington and Leicestershire Constabulary, as investigated by the IPCC, spans a period of three years and it is important to outline the structure of officers and their

roles within that time to understand their relevance in the context of this investigation.

105. In 2004 there was a five shift system in place at the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Policing Unit maintaining 24 hour police cover of the area, consisting of one Sergeant per shift together with a team of General Response Officers who responded to a range of incidents from emergencies to general enquiries. These Sergeants were referred to as 'Shift Sergeants' or 'Team Leaders'.
106. In addition there was a team of PBOs who were assigned to beat areas and were responsible for neighborhood type issues, such as anti social behaviour. Although the PBOs were attached to the five shifts as mentioned above, they worked different shift patterns and did not provide 24 hour cover.
107. The PBOs had a dedicated Sergeant, known as the 'PBO Sergeant' or 'Beat Team Sergeant' who was responsible for the management of PBOs and available to assist with neighborhood issues – including the setting of Personal Development Reviews (PDRs). When the PBO Sergeant was unavailable, the PBOs could approach the 'shift' Sergeant for more general advice and day to day supervision.
108. In April 2007 Leicestershire Constabulary realigned its boundaries to match those of the local authorities, resulting in a reduction of the Borough Command Units from four to three – the North, South and City. The South Borough Command Unit covered Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
109. April 2007 also brought about some changes to the supervision structure within Leicestershire Constabulary. For the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Policing Unit, this included a 'rebranding' of the Sergeants' roles.
110. The five shift system remained (shifts A to E) but from 1 April 2007, two Sergeants were allocated per shift and renamed 'Neighbourhood Team Leaders'. The Neighbourhood Team Leaders were now also given line

management responsibility for PBOs as well as General Duties Officers and PCSOs and there was no longer a position for a dedicated PBO Sergeant.

111. The new 'Neighbourhood Team Leaders' were also each given a geographical beat area to oversee for neighbourhood policing issues so when on duty, as well as being responsible for the incidents as they came in across the Hinckley area, these Sergeants also had a responsibility to monitor neighbourhood issues for their allocated beat (such as Barwell and Earl Shilton).
112. To ensure even coverage of all beat areas at all times, the General Duties Officers and PBOs allocated to a shift were also allocated to a beat area which meant their line manager was not necessarily the same Sergeant responsible for their beat area. For example the two Sergeants in charge of shift 'A' were allocated Barwell and Earl Shilton as their beat area. The General Duties Officers, PBOs and PCSOs officers also assigned to shift 'A', and line managed by the shift 'A' Sergeants, would not necessarily be responsible for the same beat area.
113. In practice this meant the Neighbourhood Team Leaders effectively had two strands of staff: the officers they line managed on their shift who they saw on a day to day basis and the officers aligned to their geographical area, or 'beat', who were spread across the five shifts and whom they often never saw due to shift patterns.
114. In interview PS 'H' drew a diagram to show how the shift system worked from 01/04/07 [REDACTED].
115. Supervision is also subject to further comment later in this report.

Background Information

116. Fiona Pilkington (DOB: 4 March 1969) lived at 59 Bardon Road, Barwell, Leicestershire with her son (DOB: ██████████) and her daughter Francecca Hardwick (DOB: 29 December 1988). Her son had been classified as having special educational needs. Francecca attended the Dorothy Goodman School, which catered for children with severe to profound multiple learning difficulties, as she had significant developmental delay, and was functioning at the level of a three or four year old.
117. Francecca was receiving support from Leicestershire Social Services (Children's Education) and was in the process of having a plan of action formulated within the 'Transitions Team' as she was changing from children's services to adult services and was to leave school in July 2008.
118. Fiona Pilkington's mother, Mrs. Cassell, helped out with caring for the children and she moved into 59 Bardon Road in 2004 as a result of the problems Fiona Pilkington was enduring. Consequently it was sometimes Mrs. Cassell who called the police to report problems.
119. On Tuesday 23 October 2007 at 11:18pm the Fire Brigade attended the report of a car on fire in a lay-by on the A47 towards Leicester just outside Earl Shilton.
120. Two bodies were found in the vehicle who were later identified as Fiona Pilkington and her daughter Francecca Hardwick.
121. During the early stages of the investigation police recovered four suicide notes left by Fiona Pilkington. These notes suggested she was very disillusioned with the police response to her reports of anti social behaviour.
122. In a letter to her son she wrote *'The street kids are still being intollerable'* (sic). In a letter to her mother she wrote *'The street kids well I have just given up ... I am just not cut out to take this much*

harrassment' (sic).

123. It is also clear from the letters Fiona Pilkington was finding it increasingly difficult to deal with Francecca and her behaviour.
124. Fiona Pilkington kept a file containing assorted notes which again pointed to her concern about the lack of police action regarding her reporting of incidents of anti social behaviour directed towards her family.
125. She was given advice by both the council and the police to keep notes and as such any notes made by Fiona Pilkington that directly refer to an incident are included in the chronology.
126. As a result of these findings the then Assistant Chief Constable, [REDACTED], instigated an internal investigation into the police contact with Fiona Pilkington and her family.
127. This investigation was carried out by the Review and Good Practice Section of Leicestershire Constabulary under the title of 'Operation Teak'. This investigation was completed in December 2007.
128. The Terms of Reference for 'Operation Teak' were to consider:
 - The management of and response to earlier calls to the police made by the Pilkington family.
 - The historical police contact and involvement with Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick.
 - Any historical reports made by residents of Bardon Road, Barwell.
 - Any naturally occurring issue.
129. The report identified a long history of incidents of anti social behaviour and crimes being reported by Fiona Pilkington or on her behalf. The incidents started in 1997 and there were in excess of 30 reports to the police.
130. The internal report indicated some of the incidents reported were not correctly dealt with by the police and tactical opportunities may have

been missed in their handling of the complaints of anti social behaviour.

Finding 1

131. The Operation Teak report should have resulted in a mandatory referral to the IPCC in December 2007, as defined in the IPCC Statutory Guidance.

Chronological summary of events

132. During the period from 19 November 1997 to 4 October 2007 the IPCC investigation established there were 33 calls made to Leicestershire Constabulary from both Fiona Pilkington, her mother Mrs. Cassell and other residents around the Bardon Road area directly relating to Fiona Pilkington and/or her family. The majority of these calls related to reports of either anti social behaviour or assaults.
133. The investigation also established Fiona Pilkington wrote twice to her MP (who in turn sent them onto the police) and once directly to Leicestershire Constabulary complaining about the anti social behaviour on Bardon Road in 2004 and 2007.
134. There were also a number of calls to the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, (HBBC), reporting differing levels of anti social behaviour. The reports to the council are not dealt with in this report unless they directly interact with the response given by the police to those incidents.
135. The IPCC investigation prepared a short schedule of all calls and included within the schedule any interaction with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
136. A breakdown of the calls to Leicestershire Constabulary are shown below:
- 1997: 1 call
 - 2000: 2 calls
 - 2003: 2 calls

2004: 12 calls
2005: 2 calls
2006: 1 call
2007: 13 calls

Outline of contact between the Pilkington family and Leicestershire Police between 9 January 2004 and 4 October 2007

137. **9 January 2004 (Incident 852)** – Call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road reporting youths were setting fire to the gates and throwing stones at the windows.
138. **24 January 2004 (Incident 895)** – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting five youths outside 59 Bardon Road, throwing stones at the windows, threatening/bullying her son saying they will kill him.
139. **28 January 2004 (Incident 309)** – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting her son had received further threats at school so she had removed him from school. She requested a visit.
140. **19 April 2004 (Incident 701)** – Silent 999 call received from 59 Bardon Road.
141. **26 April 2004 (letter)** – A letter dated 22 April 2004 was received by Leicestershire Constabulary from David Tredinnick MP enclosing a letter of complaint from Fiona Pilkington (dated 19 April 2004). Fiona Pilkington's letter includes complaints about children in the street, the bullying of her son and her daughter needs '24/7 care'. Leicestershire Constabulary respond to Mr. Tredinnick acknowledging his letter on the same day.
142. **27 April 2004 (Incident 621)** – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting her son had been stopped by local youths on his way to the shop, he was attacked and money was demanded.
143. **11 June 2004 (Incident 872)** – Call from Mrs. Cassell reporting ongoing problems with local youths who were sitting on her car and

moonling.

144. [15 June 2004 \(letter\)](#) – A letter dated 11 June 2004 was received by Leicestershire Constabulary, addressed to Inspector 'J', from Fiona Pilkington. This contained many issues raised by Fiona Pilkington including harassment, anti social behaviour and the effect this was having on her and her family.
145. [22 June 2004 \(Incident 800\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting ongoing problems with youths, who were outside her property taunting her disabled daughter (Francecca Hardwick). Also reports being verbally abused.
146. [25 June 2004 \(Incident 896\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting a neighbour dispute, things being thrown over fence and abuse aimed at her son. Fiona Pilkington reiterates that her son had been bullied by a neighbour's son at school and now it had started at home.
147. [03 July 2004 \(Incident 932\)](#) – Call from Mrs. Cassell reporting her grandson had been locked in a shed by two youths and had to smash his way out. Advised they want to make a formal complaint.
148. [28 July 2004 \(Incident 810\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting her son had been beaten by two youths. Reports youths tried to hit him with a metal pole.
149. [25 August 2004 \(Incident 442\)](#) – Call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road, reporting youths knocking over bins.
150. [12 December 2004 \(Incident 535\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting kids throwing stones, rubbish bags being dumped in her garden and the kids all have sticks.
151. [28 October 2005 \(Incident 699\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting youths jumping over the hedges; this was ongoing. Following this there was a second call from Fiona Pilkington, three hours later, advising youths were still being a nuisance.

152. [3 November 2005 \(Incident 756\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting same youths as last week jumping in hedge, sticking fingers up to her daughter (Francecca Hardwick) and shouting obscenities. Fiona Pilkington reported an officer spoke to them last week but it had not worked.
153. [13 October 2006 \(Incident 525\)](#) – Call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road reporting her grandson, who is dyslexic, has been pushed into the side of a van by three boys who have assaulted him before causing a hand injury.
154. [1 February 2007 \(Incident 885\)](#) – Call from a Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator, reporting youths shouting abuse at the Pilkington family home. The Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator reports there was a disabled girl (Francecca Hardwick) and her grandmother (Mrs. Cassell) there and both were very frightened.
155. [2 February 2007 \(Incident 963\)](#) – Call from a Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator, reporting youths smashing bottles outside the Pilkington family home and shouting abuse at Fiona Pilkington, who has a disabled son (██████████). It was reported Fiona Pilkington was extremely distressed and this was an ongoing problem.
156. [5 February 2007 \(letter\)](#) – A letter was received by Leicestershire Constabulary from David Tredinnick MP enclosing a letter from Fiona Pilkington (dated 1 February 2007). This letter contained details of how the behaviour of local youths was affecting her and her family.
157. [8 February 2007 \(Incident 144\)](#) – Call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road reporting four youths outside the Pilkington family home throwing snowballs at windows. It was reported this was an ongoing problem.
158. [13 February 2007 \(Incident 693\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting approximately six youths shouting and screaming outside her address. Youths would not move, even though Fiona Pilkington had

asked them to.

159. [16 February 2007 \(letter\)](#) – Leicestershire Constabulary respond to David Tredinnick MP acknowledging his letter dated 5 February 2007.
160. [11 March 2007 \(Incident 497\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting eight local youths playing football in the street and go karting on the road. They were noisy and Fiona Pilkington thought they were responsible for moving 'For sale' signs. This was an ongoing problem.
161. [6 April 2007 \(Incident 929\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting her son was constantly bullied by named youths. She reports her son riding home on his push bike and stones being thrown at him which hit him on his crash helmet. It was reported as an ongoing problem.
162. [19 April 2007 \(Incident 648\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting her son had been given money by a local youth to buy cigarettes for him but Fiona Pilkington would not let him. Fiona Pilkington tried to return the money, but the youth denied all knowledge so the money was handed into the police.
163. [2 June 2007 \(Incident 1240\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting four youths walking up and down the private driveway of the empty property next door. She reports this was an ongoing problem.
164. [3 July 2007 \(Incident 812\)](#) – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting a local youth had come to the house and accused her and Mrs. Cassell of assaulting a child. Fiona Pilkington reported PC 'C' had just been to the house to introduce himself and now the neighbours think she is telling police things. Fiona Pilkington asked police to return as she was being harassed.
165. [25 September 2007 \(Incident 867\)](#) – Call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road reporting a window has just been broken and this was the third time this had happened. It was reported the offender was not seen.

166. **26 September 2007 (Incident 774)** – Call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road reporting a gang of youths who were outside the property and throwing things at the window. It was reported this was a regular occurrence.
167. **28 September 2007 (Incident 795)** – Call from Fiona Pilkington reporting a window had been smashed by a group of five youths, which was the fifth time that week.
168. **4 October 2007 (Incident 767)** – Call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road reporting a local youth had thrown a stone at the window. The window had not been damaged but this was the sixth stone to hit the windows in the last five days.

Comprehensive Summary of contact between Fiona Pilkington and Leicestershire Constabulary between 9 January 2004 and 4 October 2007

169. What follows is a detailed summary of the above mentioned contact with police between 9 January 2004 and 4 October 2007, along with an analysis of the action taken by officers as a result of each report.

2004

Friday 9 January 2004: 8.41 pm

Incident log 852

170. The police received a call from Mrs. Cassell who reported her daughter (Fiona Pilkington) had been hounded by local youths. She informed police the youths lived up the road and had been throwing stones at the windows and setting fire to the gates. Mrs. Cassell said the youths were not there now and this had happened at 8.00 pm.
171. At 8.44 pm the log was updated '*advised caller she needs to ring in when the youths are there causing the problems. Printed to brief for info*'. The incident was then closed as 'community problems' and anti social behaviour'.

172. It is assumed the intention of the call taker by 'printing for brief' was to include this incident in the briefing of Hinckley officers at the start of their shift.
173. The log shows the incident was printed to 'WHP1' – 'WH' was the police code for the Hinckley station (this later changed to SH). It is pertinent to mention at this stage this is the first of many incidents where the Call Management Centre sent incidents for printing to the Hinckley station without any follow up action being noted or any confirmation of receipt. This will be subject to further comment later in this report.

Finding 2

174. Although the incident reported is not one that required an immediate response the advice given was not particularly helpful given the report relates to gates being set on fire and potential arson.
175. Mrs. Cassell also indicated she knew where the youths lived and could therefore identify them. It is not known whether this incident was brought to the attention of relevant officers.

Saturday 24 January 2004: 7.51 pm

Incident log 895

176. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington reporting her son had been bullied at school for the past three years, she had complained to the school but nothing had been done about it.
177. She reported a group of about five youths were outside her home address throwing stones at the windows and threatening to '*kill* [REDACTED] (her son) *at school on Tuesday*'.
178. Fiona Pilkington informed the call taker of other threats made to her son and she gave names of those youths responsible (in this report the youths will be referred to as E1, F1, G1, H1). The log states both Fiona Pilkington and her son were '*upset and worried*' and she was available

for a visit the next day.

179. At 8.58 am on Sunday 25 January 2004 the incident was updated *'viewed, the school are legally obliged to take action as they are lawful custodians whilst the juvenile is at school'*.
180. A resource was assigned and at 11.32 am the same day, the incident was updated [REDACTED] (Fiona Pilkington's son) *is special needs and gets picked on at school – has been going on for past 8 yrs. All happens on school property – they will contact the school to deal'* and the incident was closed as *'other disorder / nuisance'* and *'children / young persons'*.

Finding 3

181. The advice given is neither helpful nor correct. The police are obliged to deal with the reported incident which, in part, had taken place outside of school and should have been dealt with as a separate crime.
182. It is unclear from the incident who 'they' are, the police or the Pilkington family, who was to contact the school. Given in the initial report it was stated the school had done nothing, it was incumbent on the officers to ensure the school were aware of the issue rather than leave it to Fiona Pilkington, particularly as the officers identified her son as having special needs and was obviously a vulnerable individual.
183. Following the closure of the incident there is no further update to advise whether the officer had indeed contacted the school or whether contact had been made by the police with the offending youths.

Wednesday 28 January 2004: 1.03 pm

Incident log 309

184. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington who reported her son had received further threats today and as a result, she had removed him from school. Fiona Pilkington asked for a visit after 5.00 pm to provide details.

185. The incident was linked to incident 895 on 24 January 2004 (as above) and it was noted the officer who had dealt with the previous incident was not back on duty until 5 February.
186. At 9.03 pm the police rang Fiona Pilkington as there were no resources to attend and she gave her availability as all the following day except from midday to 1.00 pm.
187. At 9.43 am on 29 January 2004 a resource was assigned and the incident was updated at 11.02 am '*no reports – bullying advice given – NOD (no offences disclosed)*' and the incident was closed as '*other disorder / nuisance*'.

Finding 4

188. Again the response given is seen as inadequate particularly as the previous incident four days earlier is linked to this matter. There is a clear escalation with Fiona Pilkington now removing her son from school that was not identified or addressed. There is no evidence to show officers made efforts to contact the school or the youths involved.

Monday 19 April 2004: 5.23 pm

Incident log 701

189. The police received a 999 call from 59 Bardon Road but there was no speech and the phone was put down. The call taker was unable to call back.
190. A resource was assigned at 5.36 pm and at 5.52 pm officers updated the log stating they had carried out a welfare check and reported all was in order. There was no further entry to indicate the reason for the call.
191. At 5.52 pm the incident was closed as '*Threatening/Abandoned Call*'.

Finding 5

192. The response to this call was adequate, and it is noted officers were assigned almost immediately, although neither the text nor the closing code indicates what was said during the conversation between the officers and whoever made the call.

Monday 26 April 2004

Letter of complaint

193. Leicestershire Constabulary received a letter from David Tredinnick MP (dated 22 April 2004) detailing he had received a complaint from Fiona Pilkington regarding anti social behaviour.
194. Mr. Tredinnick enclosed the letter of complaint from Fiona Pilkington which was dated 19 April 2004. Incidentally, Fiona Pilkington's letter was dated the same day as the silent 999 call was made from 59 Bardon Road however the IPCC investigation has not seen any evidence regarding the reason for this call, as previously mentioned.
195. Fiona Pilkington complains to Mr. Tredinnick, the *'Children in my street seem to think that they can do anything to anyone We have informed the police but by the time they arrive the children have scarpered only to come back the next day or two. What else do you suggest we do?'* She goes on to mention vandalism of the local park and that *'the bullying of my son [REDACTED] has not stopped'*, saying *'I really am getting to the stage where I am at a loss as to what to do about most things'*. Fiona Pilkington also refers to worrying about, presumably, Government plans to get carers back into work as her *'daughter needs 24/7 care'*.
196. On the same day as receiving the letters, Superintendent 'MM' wrote back to Mr. Tredinnick and acknowledged the letter outlining the Local Policing Unit Commander, Inspector 'J', would investigate the matter and reply directly to Mr. Tredinnick.

197. In interview Inspector 'J' stated he did not take up his position as Local Policing Unit Commander until 3 May 2004 but confirmed he had been aware of the letter prior to this date due to an email he received from the force Professional Standards Department.
198. The copy obtained by the IPCC of the letter from Superintendent 'MM' dated 26 April 2004 also contains a handwritten note saying: '21/05/05 Response previously sent to Prof Standards by PS 'E''. The date of '05' is presumed to be an error and should say '04'. The investigation has been unable to establish what this response by PS 'E' involved.
199. In interview PS 'E' said he had no recollection of the letters or the response he supposedly made to Professional Standards.

Finding 6

200. It appears no action was taken at this time to deal with the issues raised by Fiona Pilkington and it was only after she wrote a further letter directly to Inspector 'J', received by Leicestershire Constabulary on 15 June 2004 (dated 11 June 2004) and the incident of 3 July 2004, it appears a PBO, PC 'B', was tasked to undertake an investigation.
201. The investigation undertaken by PC 'B' is examined in detail later in this report following the incident reported on 3 July 2004.

Tuesday 27 April 2004: 5.28 pm

Incident Log 621

202. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington who reported her son had been stopped on his way to the shops by two youths, (B1 and B2), who had demanded money from him. No money was handed over as a parent had intervened.
203. Police officers attended the address at 5.56 pm but Fiona Pilkington's son was not there. Fiona Pilkington was asked to call on his return. As no call had been made the police rang back at 9.09 pm but got no

reply, the incident was deferred until the next day.

204. At 9.32 pm on 28 April the incident was updated in the following manner: *'initially took 1st account from [REDACTED] (Fiona Pilkington's son) which was unclear, he has learning difficulties which are stated (?) According to his mum. The event was witnessed (sic),... (who) clearly said that no force, assault or threat was made, and no money or property was demanded... Upon informing I/P's mum of this, she says that in the past they have asked him ([REDACTED]) for money, after which they gave him an old bicycle which is no good, and he may have become confused by this. Therefore, there are no offences'*. Full details of the witnesses are provided on the log.
205. At 9.54 pm the incident was closed as *'incident not as reported'*.

Finding 7

206. The response by the police was swift, arriving at 59 Bardon Road in less than 30 minutes after the incident was reported. The log indicates independent witnesses were spoken to and the Pilkington family updated accordingly.
207. The incident log does however record Fiona Pilkington's son had learning difficulties but it is not known what weight was given to this by the officers.

Friday 11 June 2004: 7.20 pm

Incident Log 872

208. The police received a call from Mrs. Cassell who reported ongoing problems with local youths who lived in the street. She named the youths responsible (I1, A1, G1) and the log records *'these youths were sitting on the callers (car) bonnet and mooning'*. Mrs. Cassell requested to see a PBO to discuss the *'on - going problems'*.
209. PC 'A' was assigned the call at 7.33 pm. There is also an entry on the incident log at 7.24 pm which states PBO's PC 'A' and PC 'B' are on

duty until 3.00 am due to Operation Justify.

210. Operation Justify was a Leicestershire Constabulary initiative that involved extra patrols in Hinckley Town Centre on Friday and Saturday nights. PC 'A' explained during interview Operation Justify effectively meant he was abstracted from his PBO duties.
211. Mrs. Cassell rang back at 7.56 pm saying the named youths have twice returned since the initial call and were 'mooning' at her.
212. Despite being assigned to Operation Justify, at 8.15 pm the log was updated by PC 'A' which stated *'will call lady back – do not intend to visit'*.
213. There is a further update on the incident log from PC 'A' at 9.03 pm that reads: *'spoekn (sic) to lady – NOD (No Offences Disclosed) – anti social behaviour – will spk to Sgt ('E') re anti social behaviour order'*.
214. At 9.03 pm the incident was then closed as *'anti social behaviour'*.
215. In Interview PC 'A' stated he could not really remember the incident but had an entry in his pocket note book at 8.20 pm as follows: *'Bardon Rd. Patrol the area regarding anti-social behaviour'* and he had spoken to Mrs. Cassell over the telephone. The entry clearly shows he knew the names of the youths involved and the entry ends *'Does not appear to be any offences but their behaviour does appear to be anti social'*
216. PC 'A' stated he could not remember what he did with the incident, he may have spoken to people carrying out the anti social behaviour but he could not remember, neither was this recorded in his pocket note book or on the incident log.
217. PC 'A' did say in interview he had personal knowledge of some of the youths involved through speaking to Fiona Pilkington however, at the time of this incident he was not as familiar with them.
218. PC 'A' said he may have spoken to PS 'E', as detailed on the incident log, and told him what happened but he could not be more specific. There was nothing in his pocket note book about speaking to PS 'E'.

He said if he had spoken to PS 'E' it would have just been in passing because anti social behaviour was not a major problem in Bardon Road.

219. Although the incident log mentioned getting an Anti Social Behaviour Order PC 'A' stated he would not have said that as he knew it took a lot of time and a lot of work and an Anti Social Behaviour Order is not something you can just get from one incident. He said he may have updated the Call Management Centre and given them a lengthier update and the Call Management Centre have just condensed it.
220. In interview PS 'E' confirmed he was the supervisor of PC 'A' at the time but he could not remember, due to the passage of time, if PC 'A' had spoken to him about this incident.
221. PS 'E' went on to state if this incident had been brought to his attention he would have given the appropriate advice and there would have been an action plan instigated if the Anti Social Behaviour Order route was the route they were taking.
222. The IPCC investigation found no further documents or action plans relating to this incident.
223. Fiona Pilkington made the following note. The names of the youths identified by her have been removed for the purposes of the report:
11/06/04. 7:10pm '(Named youths) were mooning on my car in the drive. (Named youth) has been witnessed mooning on Shilton Rd Earl Shilton. Tues 8th May. Police informed 8th May.'
7:40 pm '(Named youths) came back making rude signs at my children's bedrooms, shouting abuse. (Named youth) knocked on door. Obviously bored stiff. Sick and tired of it unfortunately I can't afford a video camera.
224. *7.50 pm '(Named youth) knocked on door.'*

Finding 8

225. The result given appeared to have indicated no offences had been committed yet it records PC 'A' is to speak to PS 'E' about Anti Social Behaviour Orders. The investigation has found no evidence to show PC 'A' spoke to the offending youths or that any action was taken to deal with their behaviour.

Finding 9

226. It is also another incident PS 'E' appeared to know little about despite his supervisory role for PC 'A'. It should be noted this incident came only seven weeks after an MP's letter had detailed similar issues and three weeks after the note written on Superintendent 'MM's letter regarding PS 'E's apparent 'response' to that MP's letter.

Tuesday 15 June 2004

Letter of Complaint

227. Fiona Pilkington wrote a letter directly to Inspector 'J' (dated 11 June 2004) detailing the anti social behaviour she was suffering from and is clearly asking for help. She quotes the reference number 'MI/26/04', which refers to her previous letter sent to Leicestershire Constabulary by David Tredinnick MP in April.
228. Fiona Pilkington starts by saying '*I would like to know what else I can do*'. She mentions she has had to take her son out of school '*due to constant bullying*' and states '*we have been harrassed (sic) in our house for nearly a year*'.
229. She refers to keeping '*a folder with dates, times, names of offenders*' and that police have been round '*on more than one occasion this year (including tonight)*'. The letter is dated 11 June, which is the date of incident 872 already mentioned, and which she claims '*has started my son's (██████) asthma off. My hair has already fell out in places*'.
230. Fiona Pilkington included she had '*no means of videoing*' what was

- happening and she did not know enough neighbours to *'get a petition up'*.
231. She mentions her daughter is disabled and that *'she (Francecca) does sign language at her school Dorothy Goodmans so the yobs stick their fingers up at her'*.
232. Fiona Pilkington describes how she doesn't *'look at anyone in the street'* when she drives, *'I don't talk to many people'* and how at weekends she leaves her curtains drawn. She gives an insight into how this affects her and her families' day to day life by explaining how *'I cannot give my children the freedom of going up the street to the shops as I cannot be sure they'll be safe. I do my shopping at the weekend so I don't have to use the streets available shops when children are at home after school, during holidays'*.
233. Fiona Pilkington ends her letter by saying *'I have had enough and just want to be able to have a life'*.
234. In interview Inspector 'J' stated due to the passage of time he could not recall receiving this letter from Fiona Pilkington and even reading it again did not bring back any recollections.
235. Inspector 'J' stated he suspects he tasked PC 'B' to deal with the issues raised by Fiona Pilkington in both this letter and those issues raised in the MP's letter of April and again, although he could not remember, he stated he would have spoken to PS 'E' about the matter. He said he would have briefed PC 'B' or PS 'E' in terms of what his expectations were.
236. Inspector 'J' stated an investigation of this sort was easily within the remit of PC 'B' as PBO's were all very capable officers and experienced, professional beat managers.
237. During interview PC 'B' said he had no recollection of how he came to end up dealing with the Pilkington family as he did, commenting this related to something that happened six years ago, however he did not

think there would have been any direct verbal communication between himself and Inspector 'J'.

238. PC 'B' could not recall specifically seeing the two letters from Fiona Pilkington but presumed he had been given them at the time.
239. In interview PS 'E' said he could not recall being made aware of the letters from Fiona Pilkington. He was asked, given the content of Fiona Pilkington's letter, if he had received it, whether this was something he would have brought to the attention of the PBOs who were working in the area at the time. He said yes.
240. PC 'A' was also asked about the content of this letter as he responded to the reported incident of the same date. He said the letter did not look familiar so did not believe he had seen it at the time.
241. Regarding the content, PC 'A' stated he did not know if Fiona Pilkington made him aware that her son was taken out of school, although PC 'A' confirmed he had met her son at some point. He said he did not see any folders with dates and times of incidents and believed he would have told Fiona Pilkington to keep a log of everything and names of the people that she knew.
242. PC 'A' also said he was aware they had been *'harassed for nearly a year'* but could not say whether Fiona Pilkington had told him her hair was falling out or whether he told her to video what was happening.
243. He said he was never aware of the stress or anxiety the issues Fiona Pilkington raised in her letter were causing her. He says whenever he did see her he never got the impression she was a manic depressive, she was always bubbly and chatty and always had a little giggle and none of her behaviour rang any alarm bells with him. PC 'A' said he got the impression Fiona Pilkington was quite feisty and if there were people outside, she wouldn't have had a problem opening the doors and telling them to "do one".
244. PC 'A' could not remember if he spoke to Inspector 'J' about Fiona

Pilkington.

245. As with Fiona Pilkington's earlier letter, the investigation subsequently carried out by PC 'B' has been examined in detail later in this report following the incident reported on 3 July 2004.

Finding 10

246. This was the second letter Inspector 'J' had received relating to Fiona Pilkington and the anti social behaviour she and her family were suffering from. It is difficult to understand why Inspector 'J' did not recognise the need for a more structured / robust policing response, rather than leaving it to PC 'B'.
247. The investigation has been unable to establish at what point PC 'B' was tasked with investigating the complaints made by Fiona Pilkington, whether this was following the receipt of her second letter or as a result of the incident reported on 3 July 2004.
248. However what is evident is, as with the letter in April, it appeared no action was taken again at this time to deal with the issues raised by Fiona Pilkington and it was only following the incident of 3 July 2004 that any investigation commenced.

Finding 11

249. In hindsight the letter is distressing but even at the time, there was sufficient information contained within Fiona Pilkington's letter to give the police an insight into how the behaviour of local youths was affecting her and her family to warrant a more proactive response by Leicestershire Constabulary.

Tuesday 22 June 2004: 7.06 pm

Incident Log 800

250. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington who reported an ongoing problem with local youths, (A2, J1) who were currently outside

her house and were taunting her 15 year old disabled daughter.

251. Fiona Pilkington informed the call taker she had asked the youths to move on but was verbally abused, one youth was carrying a house brick and she was unsure of the youth's intentions.
252. Fiona Pilkington went on to say she had previously dealt with PC 'A' and the local council and she had approached the parents of the youths who had basically told her *'their sons can do what they want'*.
253. A resource was assigned at 7.19 pm and at 7.57 pm the attending officer, PC 'NN', gave the result *'Spoke to agg'd (aggrieved), advised, no complaints'*.
254. Also at 7.56 pm the log was noted *'Details to PBO'* and the incident was closed as *'other disorder'*.
255. In interview PC 'A' said he was not on duty at this time as he was on rest days from 22 to 25 June 2004. He said he was aware of this incident but it had been dealt with by other officers. PC 'A' could not remember if he had been made aware of this incident at the time.
256. PC 'A' referred to the log where it says *'details to PBO'* and stated this did not necessarily mean the incident was passed to the PBO as there were no hard and fast methods as to how incidents were passed onto PBOs. PC 'A' said he could get an email from an officer that attended, or the officer in charge may have printed off the incident and put it in PC 'A's' tray - they may not have done either - and the only way he would know about it would be to look through the OIS records (the electronic system of incident logs).
257. As the attending officer, PC 'NN' was asked to provide a witness statement in relation to this incident.
258. He stated he could not recall this incident and referred to his pocket notebook entry of that date saying he must have spoken to Fiona Pilkington and [REDACTED] ('a neighbour') as he has recorded their details. He said no details of any 'offenders' were recorded.

259. PC 'NN' could not recall details of the PBO he was supposed to have passed information to or how this had been done. He also stated it was unlikely he would have seen the actual incident log due to him not being at the station when the incident came in.
260. PC 'B' was also asked about this incident during interview and he said he had no initial dealings with this incident but did print it off on 7 July 2004 (please refer to the incident of 3 July 2004). PC 'B' also stated he could not have dealt with this particular incident directly on that day as he was involved in other unrelated enquiries.

Finding 12

261. By this time PC 'A' was aware of a certain level of anti social behaviour being directed towards the Pilkington family but appeared satisfied to let other officers, who were not PBOs, deal with matters.

Finding 13

262. It is not clear what the entry on the incident log '*details to PBO*' actually entailed. Neither PC 'A' nor PC 'B', the PBOs for the Barwell area, could confirm whether they had indeed been passed details of this incident. There is no evidence to suggest the offending youths were even spoken to nor is there any evidence of any action plan being put into place to tackle the youths' behaviour.

Friday 25 June 2004: 6.57 pm

Incident Log 896

263. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington who reported things were being thrown over the fence and the children were being abusive to her son. She further stated her son was previously bullied by her neighbour's son at school but this was now happening at home.
264. At 10.03 pm the police called back to apologise as no officer had attended. It was agreed for a visit after 3.00pm the next day.
265. At 7.01 pm on 26 June 2004 the police again called to apologise as no

resource was available. It was noted the *'caller expressed she no longer wants a visit and is happy for just the PBO (PC 'A') to be made aware'*

266. On 27 June 2004 the incident log was noted *'Copy to (PC 'A') for his attention'*.
267. At 7.02 pm 27 June 2004 the incident was closed as *'civil dispute'*.
268. As previously mentioned, PC 'A' stated during interview he was on a rest day on 25 June 2004 and he returned to duty on 26 June 2004. It appeared he visited Fiona Pilkington between 5.50 pm and 6 pm on 28 June as detailed in his pocket note book.
269. His notebook detailed he spoke to the two youths involved and their mother and the entry at the end of the note reads *'all advised'*.
270. Despite the pocket book entry *'spoke to Fiona Pilkington regarding ongoing problems'*, PC 'A' said he could not remember whether she had any ongoing problems with the neighbours mentioned but it did not immediately spring to mind it was an ongoing problem and he thought this might have been a one off incident.
271. PC 'A' stated he thought Fiona Pilkington was happy with the course of action taken but if she was not then he might have passed details onto the council but he did not know. He said every time he dealt with Fiona Pilkington she was always happy with what had been done.
272. Fiona Pilkington made the following note:
- 25/06/04*
- 6 pm 'Next door neighbours have made the V signs stuck their tongues out at my children...'*
- 6:45 pm 'They sent a message out of their mother's upstairs window...'*
273. *7:20 pm 'Rock was thrown over the fence by (named youth) near to where my daughter was in the garden. Very unfunny should it have hit Frankie I don't want to think about the consequences.'*

Finding 14

274. This is another incident where internal communications broke down. It is clear PC 'A' was aware of at least two, more than likely three, incidents reported over a 14 day period.
275. It is hard to understand why he did not start to recognise a pattern of developing anti social behaviour towards Fiona Pilkington and her family and even though he recognised the incident of 11 June as anti social behaviour, there is no evidence he did anything to deal with it. This knowledge did not seem to help him notice or identify the levels of the anti social behaviour displayed towards Fiona Pilkington and her family.

Saturday 3 July 2004: 9.11 pm

Incident Log 932

276. The police received a call from Mrs. Cassell who reported her 13 year old grandson, (████████), had been locked in a shed by two boys and had to break his way out.
277. Mrs. Cassell gave the call taker Fiona Pilkington's phone number and the incident was noted *'Have just rang caller's daughter she wants to make a formal complaint'*.
278. At 9.22 pm the incident was noted Fiona Pilkington was available for a visit anytime the following day. There was also an entry that read *'when I asked Miss. Pilkington if she had spoken to these lads parents she said "how can I they are not in", this is why her son got locked in the shed, the lads have been left to their own devices. They live at (address given)'*.
279. At 8.31 am on 4 July 2004 the incident was noted *'This would appear suitable for a PBO to follow up'*.
280. For three days there were no further entries until at 6.33 am on 7 July 2004 the incident was noted *'E-Mail sent to (PC 'B') to deal'*. At 12.20

pm PC 'B' printed the incident.

281. At 5.17 am on 8 July 2004, the incident was noted '(PC 'B') *will deal with this and has copy of the incident*'.
282. At 7.34 am 13 July 2004 the incident was noted by PC 'B': *'I have taken a crime report for this case, a statement from the mother (Miss. Pilkington) and have arranged for a video I/V (interview) to be completed with [REDACTED] (Fiona Pilkington's son)...'* A crime number was entered as WH/4049/04-0.
283. At 9.17 pm on 15 July 2004 the incident was closed with the result given as *'Criminal damage'*.
284. This incident was linked to the earlier letters from Fiona Pilkington as, following the action taken by PC 'B' which is covered in detail below, a memo was sent to Professional Standards dated 9 August 2004 by Inspector 'J' which referred to the April letter of complaint reference of 'MI 26/04'. Attached to this memo was the report written by PC 'B' which outlined the action he took in relation to Fiona Pilkington's complaint.
285. PC 'B' did not meet the Pilkington family until 7 July 2004 and in his pocket note book PC 'B' recorded:
'Wednesday 07th July 2004'
'11:30 ... clerical enqs re [REDACTED] (PS 'E') re complaints'
'To 59 Bardon Road, Barwell re allegations of bullying/harassment...'
286. Inspector 'J' was asked during interview why there was a delay in forwarding Fiona Pilkington's letter of complaint via David Tredinnick MP in April 2004 to an officer going out on 7 July 2004. He stated the enquiry would have been allocated out for PC 'B' to deal with and he would have expected PC 'B' to conduct research prior to going out, along with dealing with other incidents.
287. Inspector 'J' explained when he had tasked this to a PBO (PC 'B') he may have mentioned it to PS 'E' to oversee it. He stated this would

have been a fairly usual way of business as PS 'E' was the responsible supervisor at the time.

288. Inspector 'J' said he believed following this incident on 3 July 2004, due to this being a serious incident, PC 'B' may have been prompted for an update.
289. During interview PS 'E' agreed he and PC 'B' had spoken about something, as PC 'B' has recorded it in his pocket note book. PS 'E' confirmed he himself had nothing in his own pocket note book about this meeting, but confirmed he was on duty between 8am and 6pm that day.
290. In interview PS 'E' stated he had no recollection of this incident or the letter from Mr. Tredinnick (as previously mentioned).
291. PS 'E' could not recall having any active interaction with PC 'B' about this investigation despite confirming he had supervisory responsibility for him at that time.
292. In Interview PC 'B' agreed he had been tasked by Inspector 'J' to look at the matters raised in Fiona Pilkington's letter but could not recall if he had been tasked prior to the 7 July. The passage of time did not help PC 'B' recall this point.
293. He stated he visited Fiona Pilkington on 7 July 2004 having researched and printed off a number of reported incidents. Those incidents PC 'B' printed on 7 July 2004 are as follows:
- 24 January 2004 – incident log 895
 - 28 January 2004 – incident log 309
 - 19 April 2004 – incident log 703
 - 22 June 2004 – incident log 800
 - 25 June 2004 – incident log 896
 - 3 July 2004 – incident log 932
294. When asked why he had not taken a print of incident log 872 of 11 June 2004 PC 'B' said he did not know and presumed it was because

- PC 'A' had already dealt with it.
295. PC 'B' took a five page witness statement from Fiona Pilkington which clearly detailed a large number of problems she and her family were suffering from at the hands of local youths.
296. In this statement Fiona Pilkington described Francecca and her son as both having '*learning difficulties*' with Francecca having '*significant learning difficulties*'. It also described the extent of her son's bullying at school over the last eight years and that bullying incidents had been reported to both the school and police.
297. Fiona Pilkington goes on to describe the problems she had begun experiencing at her home address such as youths throwing stones at her windows, trying to set fire to her gate and urinating on her fence. She mentioned how the youths had shouted verbal abuse towards her house, made threats towards Francecca and her son and been verbally abusive to her adding '*they have also resorted to exposing their backsides to me on occasion*'.
298. The main perpetrators were named in Fiona Pilkington's statement as A1, A2, D1, and G1. It included she has tried to speak to the parents of the youths involved, which had resulted in some of the youths stopping their behaviour towards her son but had not worked in relation to the main participants who continued their actions towards her family.
299. More specific accounts were given of incidents that occurred on 3 January 2004, 24 January 2004, 13 June 2004, 18 June 2004, 19 June 2004 and the incident of 3 July 2004. On each occasion Fiona Pilkington provided the names of those youths involved. Most of these incidents were not reported to police at the time however, Fiona Pilkington included in the statement; '*I can produce all of the notes I have taken as police exhibit (FAP1) should they be required*'.
300. Fiona Pilkington's statement ends '*I wish for those persons responsible to be formally warned at this time, but if it continues I will proceed with*

the complaint and will be willing to attend court should it be required'.

301. PC 'B' was not sure if Fiona Pilkington was aware of the knife threat made to her son (as mentioned further on this report) and it was not mentioned in her statement to PC 'B'.
302. PC 'B' said he made the decision to conduct a video interview with Fiona Pilkington's son to obtain his account of the events of 3 July 2004 as her son's learning difficulties were evident to him, as well as being given this information by Fiona Pilkington.
303. Whilst at 59 Bardon Road, PC 'B' stated he also saw Francecca briefly when she came into the room, made a sound and disappeared. He said it appeared to him that Francecca had significant mental health issues.
304. The video interview of Fiona Pilkington's son took place on 13 July 2004 at Leicestershire Constabulary Force HQ. PC 'B' said another officer actually interviewed him as PC 'B' had not had the required training; PC 'B' instead observed and took notes.
305. During the interview Fiona Pilkington's son described playing in a friend's back garden on Bardon Road when named youths arrived, uninvited, and dragged him to one of the offending youth's houses where he was pushed into a paddling pool, into mud, threatened with a knife and then locked in a shed. When Fiona Pilkington's son was asked what he thought the youth wanted to do, he replied '*kill me*'.
306. It appeared Fiona Pilkington's son was left locked in the shed for several hours until he managed to break out and run home. It was evident he was very upset when talking about his experiences on that day.
307. As a result PC 'B' visited the three youths involved (A1, A2, D1) on 13 July 2004, along with their parents, and issued 1st stage Harassment Warnings to two of those youths (A1 and D1). Both youths were over the age of ten and therefore, above the age of criminal responsibility.

308. PC 'B' was asked why he chose to issue Harassment Warnings. He said it was the first legal step and it would allow police to arrest them should there be any further problems. He explained it was the most practical and optimal course of action particularly for any future problems.
309. He said obtaining Anti Social Behaviour Orders took time and if there were further problems with harassment police would have the option of arrest *'early doors'*, but he was also still giving them the opportunity to address the issues and stop the behaviour they were exhibiting; *'giving the parents the chance to sort the kids out'*.
310. In an earlier statement provided to the investigation and also in interview PC 'B' stated he passed on anti social behaviour advice to the families of the offending youths and with the agreement of one family, referred one of the youths (A1) to the Youth Involvement and Support Project (YISP), which was a multi-agency response which had only just come into existence at that particular time. PC 'B' said he believed it consisted of police, social services and the local council.
311. In interview PC 'B' stated he also contacted Mr 'HBBC1' at Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, who was an Anti Social Behaviour Officer, to inform him of the incident. PC 'B' stated Mr. 'HBBC1' was already aware of issues on Bardon Road and was looking for ways to resolve them. PC 'B' felt, as such, he had initiated the process of looking at the anti social behaviour procedure.
312. PC 'B' went on to state he felt he was dealing with a *'13 yr old with learning difficulties (██████ Fiona Pilkington's son) and an 11 yr old (A1), who had not come to police attention before'*.
313. When asked if he thought the incident showed an escalation of events, given what Fiona Pilkington had reported historically with the same youth, PC 'B' said he saw it as an *'11 year old kid with learning difficulties playing silly devils and trying to frighten somebody'*. He saw it as a continuation of the behaviour, perhaps a slight escalation, but

the actions he took he considered were necessarily proportionate to the ages of the persons he was dealing with.

314. Even though PC 'B' felt he had dealt appropriately with the incident, examination of the accompanying crime report (WH/04049/04-0) showed he did not document in enough detail what Fiona Pilkington's son had actually said in his interview regarding the knife.
315. He appeared to take no notice of the fact one of the 'offenders' he spoke to actually admitted his presence when Fiona Pilkington's son was locked in the shed and confirmed the other youth had a knife at the time of the incident; as detailed in PC 'B's own entry in the working sheets of the crime report.
316. PC 'B' appeared to have made no effort to try and speak to any other potential witnesses in the garden who were there when Fiona Pilkington's son was being taken away and he did not look at or examine the shed which he had been held in.
317. It is clear, as documented on the crime report by PC 'B', the parent of the youth with the knife did not believe her son had acted in such a way.
318. With this in mind it is difficult to understand how he thought the parent would actively contribute to any Harassment Warning and management of their child's behaviour.
319. It is also documented within the crime report, and referred to in PC 'B's statement, PC 'B' had arranged to meet with Mr. 'HBBC1' to discuss matters however he could not recall whether this meeting took place.
320. The crime report also documented PC 'B's intention to contact Fiona Pilkington's son's school, which was recorded in the school records.
321. PC 'B' considered his investigation was proportionate and in line with the wishes of Fiona Pilkington and her son. He said he felt he did the family '*an absolute service*' and they were absolutely happy with what he did. Even in hindsight, PC 'B' insisted he would not have done

anything differently.

322. As the youths were given Harassment Warnings, the recording of the incident on the crime report showed both offending youths and Fiona Pilkington's son as 'aggrieved'. There were no names recorded for 'offenders' or 'suspects'. The offence was recorded as 'assault' but was closed off as 'undetected'.
323. PC 'B' explained because of the processes at the time, which he thought still existed today, for first case harassment you could not classify whoever had been warned as a 'suspect' or 'offender'. He said it was a warning and not a criminal admission; neither youth could be counted as an 'offender' so they were listed as 'aggrieved' and hence why the crime report had to be closed as undetected. The issues around the recording Harassment Warnings will be addressed later in this report.
324. On 19 July 2004 Inspector 'J' received a report from PC 'B' which outlined the action he had taken in relation to the letter of 22 April 2004 and other matters that had come to light since that date.
325. Inspector 'J' stated he could not remember if any of the associated documents were attached to the report but said if not he would have looked at the crime report itself (electronically).
326. Having read the report and looked at the crime report Inspector 'J' felt the issues raised had been addressed and dealt with in a proportionate manner taking into account Fiona Pilkington's wishes.
327. On 9 August 2004 Inspector 'J' sent a memo to Professional Standards and requested the matter be filed as PC 'B' had provided a full report into his actions in dealing with the matter.
328. Prior to his interview Inspector 'J' was provided with a copy of the video interview of Fiona Pilkington's son detailing how and when he was locked in a shed and threatened with a knife. He confirmed he had not seen this video before although it was accepted there would be no

reason for him to do so.

329. Inspector 'J' stated he did not know or recall this was the allegation Fiona Pilkington's son had made and if it could have been corroborated, then it was clearly a very serious offence. He went on to say he had already said if there were any serious offences then of course that would not have rested at issuing Harassment Warnings. There would have been further consultation with Fiona Pilkington to outline the police needed to take this forward in a more robust fashion and agreed if her son had been threatened with a knife then it was more serious.
330. Inspector 'J' confirmed he would have expected PC 'B' to have detailed that Fiona Pilkington's son had said he thought he was going to be killed within his report or within the associated documents.
331. PC 'A' was asked whether he had been made aware of this incident, in his capacity as PBO for the Barwell area. He said he could not recall if he was made aware of the harassment warnings that PC 'B' issued, his recollection was he had never seen Fiona Pilkington's statement of 7 July and could not say whether PC 'B' had informed him of the action he had taken.
332. Although it is acknowledged PC 'B' took some action, particularly with the referral to YISP it should be noted PC 'B' is the only officer who ever obtained a full account by Fiona Pilkington regarding the anti social behaviour she and her family had been suffering from over a long period of time.

Finding 15

333. The closing code of Criminal Damage given in the log was incorrect. PC 'B' had recorded the crime as an assault.

Finding 16

334. It would appear PC 'B' had not started any enquiries following the MP's letter of 22 April 2004 although it is not clear when Inspector 'J' actually

tasked him to undertake the investigation.

335. Inspector 'J' and PC 'B' mainly offered supposition around the timing of when PC 'B' was actually tasked to undertake enquiries however as PC 'B' was only 'active' as a PBO from 2 June 2004 it is unlikely he would have been tasked prior to this date.
336. What is clear is that no action was taken in relation to either of Fiona Pilkington's letters until after the incident on 3 July.

Finding 17

337. The letter from Fiona Pilkington of 15 June 2004 should have received much more robust attention from Inspector 'J' prior to the incident of 3 July 2004. He should have ensured a higher level of supervision from either himself or PS 'E' was in place.

Finding 18

338. The failure in communication between Inspector 'J', PS 'E' and PC 'B' appeared to contribute to the continuing failure to collate all the incidents. PC 'A' also appeared to have no knowledge of this incident.

Finding 19

339. PC 'B' started his enquiries on 7 July but he failed to adequately investigate what at face value appears to be a very serious incident.
340. Given PC 'B's knowledge about this incident and also the high level of anti social behaviour suffered by Fiona Pilkington and her family it is difficult to understand why he felt Harassment Warnings would be sufficient following the incident of 3 July 2004.
341. When viewing the video it could be seen Fiona Pilkington's son felt his life was threatened at knifepoint and he took this as a serious threat. The report submitted by PC 'B' to Inspector 'J' did not make mention of this fact and therefore did not truly reflect the serious circumstances of what actually took place. This apparent escalation of events was more than just anti social behaviour.

342. As such Inspector 'J' could only base his decision that an effective investigation had taken place by viewing the documents put before him, which did not include the video interview or accurate details of the threats made.

343. It should however be noted Inspector 'J' had two letters from Fiona Pilkington. The letter of 15 June 2004 clearly showed her family were not only suffering from prolonged anti social behaviour but her daughter was disabled and her son suffered constant bullying, so it is also difficult to understand his decision that the matter had been dealt with effectively as the letters from Fiona Pilkington clearly indicated both her and her family were in need of a concerted approach to help them.

Finding 20

344. Although it is accepted the incidents in question took place some time ago, it is also of concern PS 'E', as PBO Sergeant, had little or no recollection of this investigation despite having a supervisory responsibility for PC 'B' who was investigating these incidents, some of which stemmed from an MP's letter. PS 'E' also confirmed he did not see the report submitted by PC 'B'.

Finding 21

345. This was an opportunity that was lost for robust action to be taken in dealing with the offenders, such as the arrest of the offenders and any possible criminal charges.

Finding 22

346. Leicestershire Constabulary had sufficient information at this point to be able to recognise the Pilkington family had become a target for harassment by local youths. This information clearly demonstrated Fiona Pilkington had wanted to protect her vulnerable children and felt unsafe in her environment.

Finding 23

347. Neither the investigation nor the council could find any evidence PC 'B' had notified the council about the anti social behaviour being suffered by Fiona Pilkington. However the investigation has also seen documentation to suggest others (Fiona Pilkington included) also made contact with the council in 2004 which the council also have no record of.
348. It should be noted there is only evidence to show the council began anti social behaviour proceedings against the individuals concerned in February 2007 following a direct call to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, as detailed in their Review Report.
349. The first evidence of a referral to the council relates to an incident on 12 February 2007 as detailed within the statements of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council staff Mr. 'HBBC2' ([REDACTED]) and Mr. 'HBBC3' ([REDACTED]) and the briefing notes supplied to the inquest by the council.

Finding 24

350. PC 'B's insistence that he would not change anything is concerning.

Wednesday 28 July 2004: 6.30 pm

Incident Log 810

351. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington who reported her son, ([REDACTED]) had been beaten up again in the street, (B1 and B2 named and address given), and he was shaken and in tears. She mentioned they had tried to hit him with a metal pole and this had just happened.
352. It was noted on the incident log at 6.32 pm that, of the two PBO's for Barwell, PC 'A' had finished duty for the day and PC 'B' was on annual leave.
353. At 6.50 pm an officer was assigned and the incident log was printed for PC 'D'.

354. At 8.41pm the incident was noted: *'Statement taken- negative statement regarding the common assault. Harassment Warning given to the two offenders'* (B1 and B2).
355. At 7.32 pm on 29 July 2004 the log was updated with the crime numbers: WH/04427/04-4 (ABH – negative taken) and WH/04428/04-7 (first stage harassment).
356. The incident was closed at 10.07 pm with the result given as *'Violence against the person'*.
357. In interview PC 'D' stated he was a PBO for an adjoining beat and as such had no previous knowledge of the problems being suffered by Fiona Pilkington and her family.
358. Due to the passage of time PC 'D' could not recall much about the incident except what was on the crime reports and could not recall seeing the printed incident log.
359. The crime report WH/04427/04-4 submitted by PC 'D' and Fiona Pilkington's son's statement note the allegation made was that her son had been verbally abused, chased and hit on both knees with an iron bar, he had red marks on both knees, his right elbow and his trousers were holed.
360. However PC 'D' felt the version of events given by the two youths, that Fiona Pilkington's son had merely fallen and had not been hit with a bar, fitted better as he noted:
- 'This story does fit, due to the hole in the trousers (trousers would not be holed by being hit with a solid object)'.*
361. PC 'D' stated he felt he had dealt with this matter in an effective manner by issuing the two youths Harassment Warnings as he thought this was the most suitable disposal at the time, in order to make the youths aware their behaviour was not acceptable. He confirmed Fiona Pilkington and her son were happy with this course of action.
362. It should be noted these youths were not the same youths as

previously warned by PC 'B'.

363. During interview PC 'D' was asked if he had looked at the incident PC 'B' had dealt with a few weeks before, or had any knowledge of this incident prior to him visiting 59 Bardon Road. PC 'D' could not recall this incident.
364. He was also asked if he recalled Fiona Pilkington mentioning the earlier incident to him. PC 'D' stated he did not recall her mentioning this or any other incidents or police contact. He stated he did not recall her mentioning anything to him other than the incident he was there to deal with.
365. As far as PC 'D' understood he felt the responsibility was on Fiona Pilkington and her son to tell any officer Harassment Warnings were in place. This is not seen as an acceptable way of working particularly in the case of Fiona Pilkington and her family.
366. Like the recording of Harassment Warnings on the crime report submitted by PC 'B', as mentioned earlier, one of the offending youths is recorded as 'aggrieved'.
367. Unlike PC 'B's' crime report, PC 'D' has recorded the other offending youth as a 'suspect' to the alleged assault on Fiona Pilkington's son.
368. PC 'D' was unable to explain this discrepancy, saying he was still a probationer and may have got confused with the recording of Harassment Warnings. He reiterated the working sheet to the crime report did confirm both offending youths had received the warnings and anyone who read the sheet would be aware of the result.
369. Fiona Pilkington made the following note:
- '28/07/04'*
- 6.25 pm (Named youths: B1, B2) beat up [REDACTED] (my son) with an iron bar.*
- [REDACTED] (PC 'D') Policeman who came and took statement'.*
370. It is not clear from the note made by Fiona Pilkington if she was aware

the statement taken from her son was in fact a negative statement which essentially meant no further action was to be taken save for the warnings.

Finding 25

371. The injuries suffered by Fiona Pilkington's son could have amounted to a common assault or actual bodily harm (ABH) and as such the investigation considers more positive action should have been taken.
372. PC 'D' was not aware of the investigation undertaken by PC 'B' following the incident of 3 July 2004. If PC 'D' had checked the CIS database he would have identified from the address an incident of crime had already taken place.
373. As such the action taken by PC 'D' is seen as inappropriate considering the evidence and information he potentially had available to him.
374. This is another incident where communication between officers has failed and may have contributed to the lack of a co-ordinated approach. It again appears to be a lost opportunity for more robust actions.

Finding 26

375. These were the second set of Harassment Warnings that month given to local youths directly relating to Fiona Pilkington and her family.
376. At the time the way Harassment Warnings were recorded on crime reports made it difficult to search for victims of anti social behaviour as both offenders and victims were, or should have been, recorded as 'aggrieved'. To establish the true position officers would have had to read all the associated working sheets sitting behind the crime report.
377. It should be noted this manner of recording was in accordance with national crime recording guidelines and was not unique to Leicestershire Constabulary.

Wednesday 25 August 2004: 2.09 pm

Incident Log 442

378. The police received a call from Mrs. Cassell who reported three youths (two named as A1 and A2) were walking down the road, knocking over the rubbish bins.
379. The incident was updated there were no mobiles/officers to attend and at 3.19 pm it was closed with the result given as *'Anti Social Behaviour/Nuisance. Area searched no trace.'*

Finding 27

380. Although one of the results given was *'area searched no trace'*, there are no entries on the log to suggest any resource was allocated to actually 'search' the area. The entries do not indicate the named youths were spoken to, the caller (Mrs. Cassell) was contacted or if the PBO was made aware.

Sunday 12 December 2004: 2.47 pm

Incident Log 535

381. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington who reported several local kids were in the street throwing stones, they had dumped a rubbish bin in her garden and were generally causing a disturbance. She reported the youths (A1, A3, youths from family G) had sticks and had been there for the last 30 minutes.
382. It was also reported these were the *'same kids (who) caused real problems last summer'* and she hoped *'this is not the beginning of further ASB'*.
383. At 3.02 pm an entry on the log stated there was no officer response to a *'blanket call'*.
384. At 3.03 pm an entry states PC 'A' is on duty the next day (13 December) and PC 'C' is next on duty on 15 December.

385. At 4.00 pm the police called Fiona Pilkington and were told the youths had moved up the street but had ripped up a for sale sign and thrown it in her garden. The incident was noted *'caller avail all evening – would like to see an officer ASAP'*.
386. Officers were assigned at 4.10 pm and at 5.08pm the incident was updated *'spoke to caller - female gets frightened of kids sitting on her wall, they have been advised and she has been advised and reassured'*.
387. At 5.09 pm the incident was closed and the result given as *'ASB/rowdy inconsiderate behaviour'*.

Finding 28

388. Although only a minor incident of damage to the sign there is no detail recorded of any consideration being given to deal with it as a crime by the officers.
389. Fiona Pilkington had named youth 'A1', who was one of the youths given a Harassment Warning by PC 'B' in July 2004. There is no evidence to suggest the attending officers considered this when they 'advised' the youths involved.

2005

390. It should be noted although the individual actions of the officers have been subject to criticism previously in this report, it is also worthy of note for whatever reason there was a reduction in reports of anti social behaviour by Fiona Pilkington and her mother as the next reported incident to Leicestershire Constabulary was not until October 2005.
391. During the time of reduced anti social behaviour the PBOs for Bardon Road were now PC 'A' and PC 'C' as PC 'B' had left his role as a PBO for other duties at the end of August 2004.

Friday 28 October 2005: 5.04 pm

Incident Log 699

392. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington who reported there were several youths in the area jumping over her garden hedge and those of other houses. She stated this was ongoing and she knew those involved.
393. At 5.19 pm the incident was updated *'no resources available'*.
394. At 5.50 pm the incident was updated *'transferred to local PBO to deal'*.
395. At 8.36 pm an entry on the log states they had received a further call (assumed to be from Fiona Pilkington) reporting the youths are still there and being a nuisance.
396. At 10.00 pm the incident was updated by a Sergeant based at Hinckley APS 'OO', *'Print out produced for (PC 'C') to deal'* with an instruction to close the incident.
397. At 10.02 pm the log states that PC 'C' was updated and the incident was closed as *'ASB inappropriate use of open space'* – there were no further updates.
398. In Interview PC 'C' stated he had no knowledge of this incident. According to his pocket note book (which he referred to during interview), on the 28 October 2005 he said he began duty at 8.00 am and finished at 6.00pm, and had been dealing with a prisoner from 9.00 am that morning until he finished his shift.
399. Although PC 'C' stated he found it difficult to recollect the systems that were in place at this time, he said it was a bit piecemeal as to how jobs got from the Call Management Centre to an officer and for a long time it was *'a bit all over the place'*.
400. He went on to say the allocation of incidents was a bit haphazard at that time as printed incident logs may have gone in a tray for allocation to PBOs or directly into an individual officer's tray.

401. In a witness statement taken from APS 'OO' he confirmed he could not recall the incident and explained his role *'at that time would be to receive a handover from the outgoing Sergeant, then look at the queue of incidents and prioritise them accordingly'*.
402. Of this incident he stated this was a Friday and he began his shift at 5.00 pm. He said *'children jumping in the hedge would have been given a low priority'*.

Finding 29

403. On this occasion, the incident was printed by a Sergeant based at Hinckley.
404. As the incident had been closed without any update, and as the officer supposed to be dealing with the incident now states he has no recollection of it, there is now no way of knowing how this incident was resolved by Leicestershire Constabulary – or by whom. At the time the incident was printed PC 'C' was not on duty.
405. It further outlines a concern over the closing of incidents which occurs on a number of occasions and clearly demonstrates there was no recording system in place to ensure a supervisor had checked and confirmed the incident had been dealt with satisfactorily.

Finding 30

406. Treated in isolation, as this incident appears to have been, the APS at the time confirmed on a Friday night, this would have been treated as a 'low priority'.
407. It should be noted that just over 18 months later, on Saturday 12 May 2007, Fiona Pilkington recorded in a diary given to her by Mr. 'HBBC3' about named youths shouting up at her house windows. In the section headed 'Are the police aware', she wrote *'no learnt from experience that no one is usually available from Friday – Monday as it's busy elsewhere. This is a low priority'*.

Thursday 3 November 2005: 7.26 pm

Incident Log 756

408. The police received a call from Fiona Pilkington who reported the same problems as last week, with youths jumping in hedges, shouting obscenities and sticking their middle fingers up at her daughter (Francecca).
409. It was also stated an officer had words with the youths last week but this had not worked.
410. At 7.34 pm the incident was noted '*Printed for [REDACTED]*'. (PC 'C') and updated there were no resources available.
411. At 7.58 pm the incident was deferred until 8.28 pm and at 8.29 pm the incident was noted '*no further calls*' and closed with the result given as '*ASB inappropriate use of open space*'.
412. This incident had been linked with the earlier incident on 28 October 2005 (incident 699) and also to another incident, reported via a 999 call at 6.59 pm on 3 November, from another resident of Bardon Road (incident log 725).
413. Incident 725 was a report of a youth throwing a stone at the caller's window. It stated this had happened before and been reported on previous occasions; the caller knew who the youth was.
414. The same Shift Sergeant, APS 'OO', who printed the log of 28 October for PC 'C' also printed log 725 for him on 5 November 2005.
415. On 12 November 2005, log 725 was updated by PCSO 'PP', they '*have found out who the offenders are and issued ASB letters to them*'.
416. The investigation has found no record of these letters and the log gives no further information regarding the identity of the offenders or where information may have been documented elsewhere.
417. In interview PC 'C' stated his pocket book showed he was on rest days from 2 to 4 November 2005.

418. He stated he returned to work on 5 November and worked a 10.00 am to 6.00 pm shift but had no note or recollection of the reported incidents; although he did state he had an entry in his pocket notebook saying he had been on Bardon Road that day but dealt with a separate anti social behaviour enquiry not related to the Pilkington family or the caller of log 725.
419. PCSO 'PP' provided a copy of her pocket notebook from 1 to 5 November 2005.
420. On 1 November it notes Fiona Pilkington and the caller of incident 725 and goes on to say she would issue '*ASBO letter*' to named youths (including A1, A2, C1, C2). On 2 November it states PCSO 'PP' had issued letters to A1 and A2.
421. On 5 November it stated letters were issued to C1 and C2. It is also recorded at 16:00 that PCSO 'PP' was in company with [REDACTED], which was PC 'C'. An entry timed 6.45 pm reads '*59 Bardon Road welfare check*'. When asked, PCSO 'PP' said as it was bonfire night, she would not have been single crewed.
422. When asked, PCSO 'PP' stated she would not have written the anti social behaviour letters herself, she would have spoken to a PBO about the issues and just delivered them. She could not recall which PBO she had spoken to, who had written the letters, what the letters said or if they were recorded anywhere.

Finding 31

423. It appeared the caller of log 725 received a police response however there were no entries on either incident log to suggest this was the case for Fiona Pilkington – even though the logs were 'linked'.
424. It was only via PCSO 'PP's entry in her pocket notebook it was established a visit had been made to Fiona Pilkington and the other caller.

Finding 32

425. Again, PC 'C' had no recollection or note of this incident despite again appearing to have been given a print out of both incidents as reported on 3 November 2005 and also the one on 28 October.
426. It would appear though from the entries in PCSO 'PP''s pocket notebook that PC 'C' did accompany her on 5 November and although he confirmed he had been on Bardon Road that day, this had been in the morning on a separate enquiry.

Finding 33

427. This is further evidence of the systems not working coherently which clearly had an adverse impact on any collation of incidents that would have identified a history of anti social behaviour and a need for a comprehensive policing response.
428. It is at least reassuring it appeared an officer did attend to the incidents reported by Fiona Pilkington, albeit this was not recorded on the initial incident.

Finding 34

429. There appeared to be no recording system in place by Leicestershire Constabulary to document the issue of anti social behaviour letters by the police.

2006

430. Reports by the Pilkington family reduced further in 2006 with only one reported incident in October.

Friday 13 October 2006: 4.32 pm

Incident Log 525

431. The police received a call from Mrs. Cassell who reported her grandson had been assaulted by three boys (named including A1 and C1) who had assaulted her grandson before, by pushing him into a van causing

a hand injury. It was also mentioned her grandson was dyslexic and the last time he was assaulted police used video evidence due to his condition.

432. At 4.40 pm the incident was noted '*No mobiles available*'.
433. At 7.19 pm the incident was updated police had re-contacted Mrs. Cassell and informed her, due to the amount of incidents outstanding they may not be able to send an officer for a while. It was noted she would be available all weekend.
434. At 8.40 am on 14 October the incident was updated '*no resources available*' and at 9.08 am was further updated there were still 27 incidents outstanding.
435. This situation remained the same as there were a number of incidents outstanding in the Hinckley area including a firearms incident.
436. At 9.25 am on 16 October the police again contacted Mrs. Cassell to request further availability over the next few days. She gave their availability as from 5.00 pm on Wednesday 18 October.
437. At 8.16 pm on 18 October Mrs. Cassell was contacted again and given an apology for the non attendance of officers and her availability was given as after 4.45 pm on 19 October. The incident was deferred until 4.30 pm the following day.
438. At 10.57 pm on 19 October the incident was updated '*no resources available*' and '*too late now*'. The incident was deferred until 4.00 pm on 20 October.
439. At 7.29 pm on 20 October, one week after the initial report, Mrs. Cassell was contacted again and she gave her availability as all weekend. The incident was noted the caller '*is very understanding*'.
440. At 11.41 am on 21 October officers attended. At 12.36 am the incident was updated '*not as reported, n/hood probs with local kids, no compl re any assault - all parties advised*'.
441. At 12.37 am the incident was closed as '*ASB rowdy and inconsiderate*'.

behaviour'.

442. This incident was referred to in a letter Fiona Pilkington wrote to her MP dated 1 February 2007 (covered in detail later in this report) within which she stated:
443. *'I phoned the police last October 13th because someone tried belting him ([REDACTED] Fiona Pilkington's son) into a van several times. When the police did come round days later they stood in my living room and asked "what did I want doing about it".'*

Finding 35

444. The police took eight days to respond to this allegation of assault.
445. It is difficult to understand why this situation was allowed to occur bearing in mind Fiona Pilkington's son was a repeat victim of crime, his age and vulnerability; this was again a lost opportunity for the police to take robust action and any opportunities to gather evidence of any assault would have been lost or greatly reduced.
446. There is no evidence to suggest officers made contact with the youths responsible for the alleged assault and no crime report was generated.
447. Their advice to Fiona Pilkington may have contributed to her lack of confidence and frustration in reporting incidents to the police as; detailed in the letter to her MP in February 2007 (covered later).

2007

448. 2007 saw a significant increase in the number of incidents reported by, or on behalf of, Fiona Pilkington.
449. The PBOs for the Barwell area were still PC 'A' and PC 'C'. PC 'D' was now a PBO for the Earl Shilton area and although by this time it appears Earl Shilton and Barwell were now classed as one beat, in practical terms the PBOs tended to work them as two separate beats – crossing over when required.

450. It appeared PS 'E' had oversight of the PBOs until April 2007 when the restructure occurred. The PBOs were then supervised by different Sergeants with PS 'G', PS 'H' and APS 'I' having responsibility for the Barwell area (but not necessarily the Barwell PBOs) at various stages.
451. PS 'F' had responsibility for the supervision of Neighbourhood Policing for the whole of Hinckley and Bosworth and also support of all PBOs.
452. The Local Policing Unit Commander was Inspector 'K' until 10 July 2010 and Inspector 'L' after this date.

Thursday 1 February 2007: 8.37 pm

Incident Log 885

453. The police received a call from a local Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator, who reported she had been contacted by the occupier of 59 Bardon Road and youths were shouting abuse at a disabled girl called Francesca (sic). It was further mentioned the girl was with her grandmother and both were very frightened.
454. At 9.38 pm the police called the Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator, who did not have the phone number for 59 Bardon Road. The Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator did however provide the names of the youths responsible (A1, B1 and B2).
455. The incident was noted police '*will not make this tonight due to breaks/MISPER (missing person) and a firearms inc*' and as such the incident was deferred to 7.54 am on 2 February 2007.
456. There were a number of entries on the log over the next three days indicating there were no resources available to attend and they still did not have the phone number for 59 Bardon Road.
457. There was also an entry at 10.52 pm on 2 February stating this log had been linked to incident 963 of 2 February 2007 (see below).
458. At 10.00 am on 5 February the incident was updated '*defer for attention of PBO*'. At 2.31 pm it was noted '*printed for [REDACTED] (PC 'D')*' and '*PC*

██████ ('D') aware' and the incident was closed with the result 'ASB rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour'. ██████.

459. Fiona made the following note:

01/02/07

(Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator phone number)

8.25 pm 'Picked up next door neighbours for sale sign and threw it breaking it. Tried putting his bikes front tyre through our hedge (lists names). Are we actually entitled to live here without fear of going mentally insane with worry about what's actually happening outside. Just posted a couple of letters at 7 pm, how can you live in a place like this.'

460. In interview PC 'D' confirmed he was on duty on 5 February 2007 but stated he had no knowledge of this incident. He went on to state at the time the process of printing incidents to PBOs was an issue as logs could end up anywhere. He also stated closure of the incident stating him as the officer in the case, in his opinion was wrong.

461. It should be noted PC 'D' was a PBO on an adjoining beat and not the PBO for the Bardon Road area although he did technically have responsibility for both beat areas.

Finding 36

462. The deferring of the incident on 1 February 2007 to the following day when a report had been made of a disabled girl being verbally abused and the mention that both her and her grandmother were very frightened is seen as concerning and below the level of service expected.

Finding 37

463. The three youths named in this incident are three of the same youths who were issued Harassment Warnings in relation to the Pilkington family in 2004.

Finding 38

464. In addition to the delay as recorded on the incident log, it is not acceptable the investigation has been unable to establish if any officer actually responded this incident.
465. Again an incident has been closed without any resulting action being recorded. There is no evidence of any crime report being created or of any officer making contact with the named youths, despite them being recorded as having Harassment Warnings in relation to the Pilkington family.

Friday 2 February 2007 9.23 pm

Incident Log 963

466. The police received another call from the local Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator who reported youths were congregating outside 59 Bardon Road smashing bottles and being abusive to the occupants. She further outlined the occupant was called 'Fiona' who had a disabled son and was feeling extremely distressed as this was an ongoing problem.
467. There was no description of the youths but the Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator advised the call taker there were about twelve youths in total.
468. At 10.52 pm this incident was linked with incident 885 (the incident reported on 1 February as detailed above).
469. At 10.53 pm the incident was updated stating '*no further calls and will deal with this on linked*'. It was then closed as an '*admin duplicate incident*'.
470. PC 'D' stated during interview he had no knowledge of this incident.

Finding 39

471. Again, there is no evidence on this log to suggest a resource was

assigned to this incident. Instead it was linked to the one reported the previous day and closed.

472. The entry 'no further calls' is perplexing, there had already been two similar incidents reported on consecutive days which clearly indicated vulnerable individuals were in fear and distress. The lack of police response to these calls is difficult to comprehend.

Finding 40

473. The incidents of 1 and 2 February 2007 provides further evidence of the systems not working coherently and raise concerns over the practice of closing incidents which clearly do not allow supervisors to confirm the incident has been dealt with effectively – or at all.

Monday 5 February 2007

Letter of Complaint

474. Leicestershire Constabulary received a letter from David Tredinnick MP (dated 5 February 2007) enclosing a letter from Fiona Pilkington. He detailed he had received a complaint from Fiona Pilkington regarding problems with youths in her area and stated he would *'be most grateful for anything that can be done to help her'*.
475. On 16 February 2007 Chief Superintendent 'QQ' wrote back to Mr. Tredinnick and informed him the letter had been forwarded to Inspector 'K' the Local Policing Unit Commander.
476. Fiona Pilkington's letter was dated 1 February 2007; the same date as incident 885. She begins by saying *'I really don't know how to handle anything anymore'* and goes on to describe how that evening *'6 kids were outside my house riding (ha) bikes into my hedge'*.
477. Fiona Pilkington also described the incident that took place on 13 October 2006, as already mentioned earlier in this report.
478. She wrote she had *'no where to turn'* and how she could not afford cameras; presumably to record the behaviour of the youths as she then

stated *'that until it's on more than paper no one can help'*.

479. Fiona Pilkington referred to police several times in this letter, including that she seemed to be the only one on the street willing to call them *'not that it does any good'* and how *'parents, police, neighbours who watch what goes on and say/do nothing'*.
480. This letter mentioned how Fiona Pilkington's mum stayed with her because of how the behaviour of the youths was affecting her and her children. As in her last letter Fiona Pilkington referred to her hair falling out and although she did not refer directly to having a disabled child, she did include she did not *'earn enough as a carer to move'*. She mentioned taking *'11 years of criminal damage, abuse'* and also indicated she did not feel safe at night.
481. The tone of Fiona Pilkington's letter clearly reveals her frustration and anxiety, including frustration with the police response.
482. On 20 March 2007 an email was sent by Chief Superintendent 'QQ's secretary to Inspector 'K' chasing an update on Fiona Pilkington's complaint.
483. On 28 March 2007 a further email was sent to Inspector 'K' and this time, also to PC 'A', again from Chief Superintendent 'QQ's secretary.
484. PC 'A' responded to this email on the same day stating he had visited Fiona Pilkington at her home address. His email also said he had been in contact with Mr. 'HBBC3' at Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council who had advised PC 'A' the youths responsible had been issued with Anti Social Behaviour letters. It also stated both Mr 'HBBC3' and Fiona Pilkington had told him things had quietened down. PC 'A' further detailed he would monitor the situation.
485. It should be noted between the date of Mr. Tredinnick's letter and the date of PC 'A's email, three further incidents were reported by Fiona Pilkington and Mrs. Cassell. These are covered in detail later in this report.

486. On 30 March 2007 Chief Superintendent 'QQ' wrote back to Mr. Tredinnick detailing how PC 'A' had visited Fiona Pilkington who had informed him the incidents had reduced. He also wrote there had been contact with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and the youths responsible had been issued with Anti Social Behaviour letters. He added PC 'A' would continue to monitor the situation.
487. In interview PC 'A' did confirm he had seen Fiona Pilkington's letter before, although he could not recall when he actually received it or when he visited her.
488. PC 'A' could not remember in detail what actions he carried out and what was said in any meeting with Fiona Pilkington but did say that most of the things outlined in her letter were already being dealt with. He also said at some stage he and Mr. 'HBBC3' visited Fiona Pilkington together and it was reiterated she needed to keep a list of incidents.
489. PC 'A' said following Fiona Pilkington's reports a number of local youths were issued with Anti Social Behaviour letters by Mr. 'HBBC3'.
490. Regarding the email he sent on 28 March, PC 'A' was asked what he was 'monitoring'. He said he was monitoring the level of anti social behaviour incidents in the area of Bardon and Bradgate Road, increasing patrols in the area and occasionally he would pop in and ask Fiona Pilkington if everything was alright. PC 'A' could not say how many times he visited Fiona Pilkington after she wrote the letter to Mr. Tredinnick.
491. When asked if there was anything in place to record this 'monitoring' PC 'A' could not recall, neither could he recall any kind of action plan being set up.
492. PC 'A' was asked whether he had any contact with Inspector 'K' about the information contained within the email or letters, he could not say whether he did or did not but confirmed he would not have spoken to

Chief Superintendent 'QQ' about it.

493. In interview Inspector 'K' had no recollection of the letter and he could not remember whether he had tasked PC 'A' to deal with it.
494. He went on to say it looked like PC 'A' was dealing directly with Chief Superintendent 'QQ', stating this would have been unusual but occasionally it happened, and as such he could not remember whether he discussed the incident with PC 'A' or even if he saw a final report from him.
495. Inspector 'K' was asked whether he would have, or should have, had any role in ensuring that PC 'A' was indeed 'monitoring the situation' once he had been out to visit Fiona Pilkington. He said as an individual incident 'no'.
496. He was asked if it was usual for him to get letters of this nature in his role as Local Policing Unit Commander, Inspector 'K' said he received lots of them and not necessarily just from an MP, but from different sources such as councillors.
497. Inspector 'K' also stated in his interview he was not aware of Mr. Tredinnick and Fiona Pilkington's letters of 2004 saying *'they were of no concern to him at that moment in time'* as he had not dealt with them.
498. When asked if he should have been aware or updated with information about the existence of the 2004 letters Inspector 'K' explained this had been twelve months before he even took over as Local Policing Unit Commander he would not expect to have been told about it. He was asked if there was a system in place to make him aware of any previous complaints, Inspector 'K' said there was not.
499. In essence Inspector 'K' had no recollection of the investigation and did not believe he should have taken any steps to find out, despite two emails of the 20 and 28 March 2007 sent to both him and PC 'A' asking for an update.

500. He went on to say the Hinckley policing area was one of the busiest and there was no way he could be expected to know everything that was going on.
501. In interview PS 'E' stated in his role at the time, with a responsibility for the PBOs, he believed he should have been made aware of the letter and could not explain why Chief Superintendent 'QQ' apparently dealt directly with PC 'A'. It should be noted the first Anti Social Behaviour letters were sent by the council on 14 February 2007. As such these letters appeared to have been generated by a call by Fiona Pilkington to the council's Anti Social Behaviour Coordinator and not by any action taken by PC 'A' in March 2007 as it is unlikely he was allocated to deal with the letter until after 16 February and in interview, said he had no knowledge of the incidents reported in February.
502. The council report to HM Coroner clearly stated the council had no further contact about the problems being faced by Fiona Pilkington until 10 April 2007 when she rang Mr. 'HBBC3' direct and on 27 April 2007 following a case referral via PC 'D'; although this referral only raised concerns about anti social behaviour in the area generally and did not name Fiona Pilkington or her family.

Finding 41

503. The anti social behaviour letters were sent on 14 February 2007 to youths A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2, E1 and F1, following an incident that PC 'A' had no recollection of and they were not served as a result of the actions taken by PC 'A' following Fiona Pilkington's letter.
504. PC 'A' did not appear to undertake any research which may have linked this letter to PC 'B's investigation in 2004 and the more recent events in early February 2007. No witness statement is recorded as being taken from either Fiona Pilkington or her mother, Mrs. Cassell.

Finding 42

505. There again appears to be a failure in the chain of communication

between Inspector 'K', PS 'E' and PC 'A' which contributed to the continuing failure to collate all the incidents and deal with them in an effective manner.

506. The fact neither Inspector 'K' nor PS 'E' appeared to know of this letter again prevented anybody undertaking any proactive level of supervision to ensure an effective investigation took place.

Finding 43

507. The investigation found no evidence of any plan or strategy by PC 'A' or any other officer to 'monitor' the situation.

Thursday 8 February 2007: 9.20 am

Incident Log 144

508. The police received a phone call from Mrs. Cassell who reported she had 4 youths, (A1 named), throwing snowballs at the window. She stated she was having ongoing problems with these youths and requested a visit *'to discuss if anything can be done'*.
509. At 10.21 am the incident was updated *'This lady has been the subject of ongoing hassle with local youths not just snowballing this morning. When resources allow can a PCSO please (sic) make a reassurance visit'*.
510. At 4.25 pm on 9 February the incident was updated by PS 'RR'; *'Allocated to PCSO ('SS'). She will visit and reassure victim. Please close'*.
511. At 7.07 pm the log was noted PCSO 'SS' had been updated and the incident was closed as *'ASB rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour'*.
512. In her statement PCSO 'SS' [REDACTED] confirmed she had no recollection of being allocated this incident and no record of any action taken.
513. Despite this, an entry in her pocket notebook dated 09 February 2007 stated she visited 59 Bardon Road regarding trouble with youths. It

further stated she *'received list of names, advised and will be looking forward to ABC letters to offenders'*.

514. PCSO 'SS' said in her statement she could not recall sending any letters but believed she would have passed the list of names to one of the PBOs as she said she would have been unsure what to do with it. She could not recall who she spoke to or what was said.
515. PS 'RR' referred to this incident in his witness statement and confirmed, in his role as Shift Sergeant, he *'allocated this to PCSO ('SS'). I would have physically handed the incident to her or radioed for her to deal with it when she was free'*.
516. On the closing of incidents PS 'RR' stated if the incident was a crime it would be left open for a crime number however if it was not it could be closed.

Finding 44

517. This is another incident that was closed prematurely which meant there was no record on the incident log to establish if the incident had been dealt with.
518. PS 'RR's comment regarding the closing of incidents at that time suggests a result would not be expected on the incident log for reports of anti social behaviour unless a recordable crime had taken place.
519. MP's letter aside, this is the third reported incident in less than a week by the Pilkington family where the incident has been closed before a result a recorded.

Finding 45

520. This is the second known incident where a PCSO referred to the issue of anti social behaviour letters yet the investigation has not seen any of these letters or any record (with the exception of PCSO 'PP's pocket note book).
521. Even if PCSO 'SS' passed the details of the youths to PBOs, there is

no evidence to suggest this information was acted on by officers. There is no evidence of any officer speaking to the youths involved; despite one youth in particular being named on two of these logs.

522. Although Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council issued letters to youths on 14 February 2007, this was the result of a direct call to the council from Fiona Pilkington and not via the police.

Tuesday 13 February 2007: 6.19 pm

Incident Log 693

523. The police received a phone call from Fiona Pilkington who reported six local youths outside her address who had been there since 5pm shouting and screaming, she had asked them to move but they would not. Fiona Pilkington asked for an officer to attend and help her.
524. At 6.24 pm the incident was updated '*no resources available*' and was further updated at 8.59 pm '*we have no mobiles to check this out – suggest that this be passed to CSO/PBO to follow up*'.
525. At 9.03 pm the incident log was updated stating Fiona Pilkington had been spoken to, the youths had now left the area as it was raining and she was happy for the local PBO/PCSO to make contact with her regarding the ongoing problems.
526. At 4.07 am on 14 February 2007 the incident was updated '*Printed for AM PCSO attn*'.
527. At 1.44 pm on 14 February this report was linked to incident 613 of 13 February and at 1.45 pm it was closed as '*Admin duplicate incident*' with no further update.
528. The linked incident, 613, was a call at 5.02 pm on 13 February 2007 on behalf of another resident of Bardon Road. The caller reported there were a group of youths outside a house on Bardon Road harassing the occupant. This did not relate to the Pilkington family.
529. The entries on log 613 for 13 February are pretty much in line with

those recorded on Fiona Pilkington's log; the caller was telephoned, it was suitable for a PBO/PCSO to follow up and there were no resources to deal with it at that particular time. On 14 February an update reads '*Printed for AM PCSO attn*' – this is recorded at the same time as the identical entry on Fiona Pilkington's log.

530. Further entries on 14 February made by a Hinckley Sergeant (PS 'TT') on incident 613 clearly link the two incidents and the suggestion was made that '*it makes sense for (PC 'A') to make contact and re-assure the parties suffering harassment from local youngsters*'. The incident was deferred for after 3.00 pm that day when PC 'A' was on duty however, due to another incident PC 'A' was unable to deal with either incident that day and it was deferred again.
531. At 8.23 pm on 15 February, an entry on log 613 states PS 'TT' had spoken to PC 'A' who '*will deal with this matter in line with his beat commitments*'.
532. At 9.56 am on 16 February, incident 613 was updated by PS 'F'; '*this appears to be a matter of ASB that the OIC (officer in the case) has in hand and will complete enquiries accordingly*'. Incident 613 was then '*printed off for the attention of (PC 'A') to action as an ASB matter*'. There are no entries to indicate Fiona Pilkington's incident was also printed at this time. PS 'F' requested the incident be closed at this stage '*with enquiries in hand*' and at 10.07 am incident 613 was closed with the result '*ASB rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour*'. There were no further updates.
533. PC 'A' stated in interview he was not sure if either of these incidents had been allocated to him as he did not have them recorded anywhere, nor could he recall them. PC 'A' felt it may have been an assumption made by PS 'F', as his supervisor at the time that PC 'A' would deal with the incidents as he was already dealing with anti social behaviour in the area.
534. PC 'A' was asked about PS 'TT's entry on 15 February that they had

spoken and he could not recall this.

535. He was asked about how PS 'F' would allocate enquiries of this nature to him at the time. PC 'A' said PS 'F' would physically give him the incident or send him an email saying he had put the incident in PC 'A's' tray.
536. In Interview PS 'F' confirmed with regard to the linked incident (613) he could not remember dealing with it fully. He referred to the entry on 15 February 2007 at 8.23 pm on the log by PS 'TT' and said the incident was sent to the station queue, which meant it would have been sent to the electronic Sergeant's queue at Hinckley police station, in order for it to be allocated to an officer. PS 'F' stated on 16 February 2007 he would have looked at the incident and seen they had tried to allocate it to PC 'A'.
537. PS 'F' stated he may have had a conversation with PC 'A' about the incident before he printed it off, but he could not be sure. He also said he would normally complete a handover package if he was not going to be around when the officer came on duty, so he would have left the incident for the next shift Sergeant to give to PC 'A'.
538. PS 'F' confirmed although the incident log showed he was the officer in the case, it was in fact PC 'A'.
539. When asked why he closed the incident PS 'F' said it was because the enquiries were being dealt with in the long term.
540. Regarding incident 693 PS 'F' said he might have read it, he might not saying it was not clear to him when he was dealing with incident 613 that it was linked with incident 693.
541. PS 'F' clarified if he left something in somebody's tray for them, he would tell them he had done this because some officers had so much stuff in their in - tray.
542. Fiona Pilkington made the following notes:
'13th. (named youth) and his gang started outside tonight by pulling my

front hedge and looking in at 5pm. Can't believe they are still bored with nothing better to do.

Feb 13th (named youths). Actually went through no 57 gate just to pull the sign down again.

13th Went to the shop with [REDACTED] and had one of the lads in gang following us.

5:30 Had a word with me about the pervert in the red who takes photos of them (Police have instructed Fiona to take photos of perpetrators so we and they know who they are) (sic).

13/02/07 6:15 pm. I have been accused of taking photos of his sister on the roadside so I told him the only photographs we took was of (named youth) on (?) our side of the fence because he was trespassing it was nothing to do with his sister at all. I have never seen his sister face to face let alone take a photo of her. The Police have told us to take photos of troublemakers the only problem is we haven't got a camera that works even the phone one doesn't work in the dark.

13th No 57 had a van turn up to put sign back up they had put it by the tree at approx 6 pm 6:30 pm. It's back down in the hedge. What a waste of time.

Most unsettling for my daughter.'

543. It should be noted on 12 February 2007 Fiona Pilkington reported the nuisance behaviour of the local children to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. This is the first evidence of contact by the council relating to Fiona Pilkington and reports of anti social behaviour.

Finding 46

544. This is yet another example of the failure in the system in the allocation and monitoring of incidents.
545. It seems incomprehensible PC 'A' would appear to have been informed of these incidents by two different Sergeants and yet still seems to have not known about them.
546. It would appear the call by Fiona Pilkington was not dealt with as it was

incorrectly linked to another incident. There was also an assumption made something was going to happen in the future.

547. Despite the clear indication on both incident logs they were linked neither the Call Management Centre staff, PS 'F' or PC 'A' noticed they were in fact separate reports and another opportunity to help Fiona Pilkington was lost.
548. This is the fourth incident reported to police in relation to the Pilkington family in less than two weeks. None of the incidents record a response or any actions taken.

Sunday 11 March 2007: 2.19 pm

Incident Log 497

549. The police received a phone call from Fiona Pilkington who reported ongoing problems in the street with 8 youths at present playing football, go karting on the road and generally being noisy. She believed they were also responsible for moving 'for sale' signs and she requested they be advised.
550. Officers attended and at 2.37 pm the incident was updated '*had a chat to youths and hopefully will resolve problem*' and the incident was closed as '*ASB Rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour*'.
551. In his statement, PCSO 'UU' confirmed attending the incident in company with PCSO 'SS' but could not recall any details of the incident, the identity of the youths involved or what was said to them.

Finding 47

552. The police responded quickly, within 20 minutes of the call. However again there was no evidence any of the previous incidents were considered and this was treated as an isolated incident.

Friday 6 April 2007: 8.54 pmIncident Log 929

553. The police received a phone call from Fiona Pilkington who reported her son was being constantly bullied by local youths (names given as A2 and C1) and tonight these youths had thrown stones at her son as he was riding his bike, which had hit his head although luckily he was wearing a helmet.
554. It was further mentioned this was an ongoing problem which was being dealt with by PC 'A'.
555. At 8.59 pm the incident was printed for PC 'A' and a crime report was generated with the reference SH/00130/07-5.
556. At 9.10 pm the incident was updated with the information PC 'A' was not back on duty until Tuesday 10 April. The incident was noted that CIS (police Crime and Intelligence System) had been checked and there were no other crime reports relating to Fiona Pilkington's son in the previous 100 days. It was also noted CIS had been checked for the two named offending youths and there was no trace.
557. At 9.20 pm Fiona Pilkington was called back and the incident was updated *'these lads have been harassing the whole street and being a general nuisance for some time – The council are involved and have sent them a letter which hasn't helped at all ... she is happy for another officer to attend – I have advised her to tell the officer all the things that have been happening and discuss poss harassment from these lads'*.
558. At 9.23 pm the incident was sent to the Sergeant's queue for allocation in accordance with its grading.
559. At 1.10 pm on 7 April the incident was updated by PS 'F'; *'PC 'D' to attend ... printed for (his) attention'*.
560. At 11.34 pm the incident was closed with the result *'Crime violence and public order'*.

561. In interview PC 'D' recollected being allocated the incident on 7 April however he was redeployed to three other incidents before he was able to deal with it on 8 April 2007.
562. From speaking to both Fiona Pilkington and her son, PC 'D' said it became clear this was a minor incident and it was a case where he considered the appropriate course of action was to instigate anti social behaviour proceedings via the council.
563. He said he believed Fiona Pilkington would have told him her son had learning difficulties, but he could not clearly remember.
564. PC 'D' confirmed he went and spoke to both youths involved and although they denied throwing stones, he gave them stern words of advice to stay away from Fiona Pilkington's son. PC 'D' also informed them the incident would be reported to the council.
565. PC 'D' completed the crime report SH/00130/07-5 in which he detailed his rationale in dealing with the incident by speaking to the youths involved. He also noted Fiona Pilkington's son had not wished to provide a witness statement and he had been in contact with Mr. 'HBBC3' at Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
566. PC 'D' recorded in the report Mr. 'HBBC3' was well aware of the families involved and had asked PC 'D' to submit a statement to him; warning letters would then be issued to both offending families involved. PC 'D' clarified in interview this should have read Anti Social Behaviour *Contracts* would be issued, not letters, as warning letters had already been issued by the Council in February 2007.
567. PC 'D' recorded he would submit a statement to Mr. 'HBBC3' and the crime report was submitted as 'undetected'.
568. In interview PC 'D' accepted he did not submit any statement to either Mr. 'HBBC3' or Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and had no record in his pocket book about the warnings given to the youths following the incident.

569. However, during interview PC 'D' produced his 2007 working diary and on 26 April 2007 an entry reads '*send email re: Bardon Road to (Mr. 'HBBC3')*'; this entry had been crossed through. PC 'D' stated having read this entry to himself it reminded him that Mr. 'HBBC3' had told him he did not have to do a statement and he could send the information via an email.
570. PC 'D' confirmed he did not know if he actually sent the email to Mr. 'HBBC3', but he did write it down in his diary and crossed it off, as if he had sent it. He also stated if he did send this email he probably would have cut and pasted the working sheet from the crime report.
571. PC 'D' said he was not aware until he was provided with documents by the IPCC prior to his interview of any anti social behaviour letters being sent to the youths involved in this incident.
572. In interview PS 'F' said he could not recollect this incident and explained as this incident had been given a crime number, the officer would essentially work from the crime report and not the incident log.
573. PS 'F' could not recollect seeing the associated crime report either stating at this time he was Citizen Focus Sergeant and as such, he would not get involved in PBO's crime reports as the supervision for this would have fallen to the officer's Shift Sergeant. He stated if there were a number of incidents, in a quick succession of time that were all linked together, then they should have gone to him but this would be for the PBO to raise it with him.
574. It should be pointed out here between February 2007 and 6 April 2007 there had been six calls and one letter from a local MP all relating to the Pilkington family.
575. In interview APS 'I' confirmed he had no recollection of this incident or the crime report, although he did have supervisory responsibility for PC 'D' at that time, stating he monitored thousands of crime reports and did not recall this one.

576. Fiona Pilkington made the following note:

06/04/07 8:40 pm. (Named youths) threw 2 stones at my son whilst he was riding his bike hitting his helmet as he was riding past the corner shop into this street. [REDACTED] (Fiona Pilkington's son) riding back from his grandmas.

(PC 'A'). Tuesday. Assault. Incident number. Crime bureau. SH/130075.

(PC 'A') came round today being 14/04/07 to deal with the above that (PC 'D') dealt with Sat 08/04/07.

577. PC 'D' stated he believed PC 'A' attended 59 Bardon Road, not knowing PC 'D' had already been. He believed this was because the crime report had initially been allocated to PC 'A'.

578. He said he could recall speaking to PC 'A' about this, and PC 'A' had asked him to put a working sheet on the crime report, but could not recall when they had spoken.

579. During interview PC 'A' could not really recall this incident, saying he suspected if he had attended it would be for reassurance as PC 'D' would have already dealt with the incident. He could not say whether he spoke to PC 'D' about this or not.

580. On 10 April 2007 Fiona Pilkington called Mr. 'HBBC3' at the council to report local youths throwing stones at her window.

Finding 48

581. There was a clear opportunity to engage with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and ensure a proactive multi agency approach to deal with the anti social behaviour being suffered by Fiona Pilkington and her family. However PC 'D' failed to submit the statement and the opportunity was missed. The investigation could neither prove or disprove that PC 'D' sent an email to Mr. 'HBBC3' on 26 April.

582. The investigation undertaken by PC 'D' was at the time one of a number of reported incidents from Fiona Pilkington including the letter

from David Tredinnick MP. He was also aware PC 'A' had been dealing with other matters with regard to this family as this is detailed on the log and the crime report.

583. Despite PC 'D' recalling some kind of conversation with PC 'A', this appeared to be concentrated more on who would be completing the paperwork and as such, there appeared to be no communication between any of the PBOs or supervisors about the incidents themselves.
584. Any kind of collation of the incidents could have presented an opportunity for a more structured policing and multi agency response. This is another incident where a vulnerable victim of crime was let down by the police.

Finding 49

585. This is the first and only time there is any record on the incident logs of any background / history checks being made in relation to reports by the Pilkington family.

Thursday 19 April 2007: 5.38 pm

Incident Log 648

586. Fiona Pilkington attended the Hinckley front enquiry office and reported her son had been handed money by a 14 year old named youth (A1) and asked to buy some cigarettes. Fiona Pilkington did not want him to do this and had tried to give the money back to the youth who denied any knowledge.
587. As a result Fiona Pilkington handed the money in to the police which was booked in and no further police response was required.

Finding 50

588. Although the youth involved was one of the perpetrators of the anti social behaviour / harassment of the Pilkington family, this does not appear to be a report to police by Fiona Pilkington regarding related

problems on this occasion.

Thursday 10 May 2007

Diary Entry and Note made by Fiona Pilkington

589. There is an entry in the diary given to Fiona Pilkington by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Anti Social Behaviour Co-ordinator Mr. 'HBBC3' as follows:

'10/05/07'

'7.20 pm: (Named youths) ramming their bikes into my front hedge and into my car parked on my drive'.

In the column headed 'How has it affected you or your family':

'My daughter will not settle down until very late at night then does not want to get up. My son is restless walking up and down the stairs until it's quiet outside'.

In the column headed 'Are the police aware':

'Yes [REDACTED] (PC 'D')'.

590. Fiona Pilkington also made the following note:

'(PC 'D') 10pm Voice mailed 9pm 10/05/07 7.20pm'

(Named youths)

'Outside my house looking into Frankies bedroom yet again. Then ramming bikes into my car and hedge.

I am suppose to be the adult but I feel like a quivering wreck.

What am I suppose to do.

My hedge my car my adolescents.

I'm suppose to respect them.

Constantly acting like they own everything and can do as they please.'

591. PC 'D' was asked during interview about the diary entry and note made by Fiona Pilkington. He stated he was not aware of this incident, neither did he recall ever getting a voicemail from Fiona Pilkington.

592. PC 'D' checked his pocket notebook for that day during interview and stated he worked a 1.00 pm to 10.00 pm shift on the Mini Motor Action

Plan, in Earl Shilton.

Finding 51

593. The investigation found no evidence of a voicemail, and there is no record of any incident reported to Leicestershire Constabulary on 10 May 2007 to correspond with the notes made by Fiona Pilkington.

Saturday 2 June 2007: 11.04 pm

Incident Log 1240

594. The police received a phone call from Fiona Pilkington who reported four youths kept walking up and down her private drive. She names two youths (A1 and A2) as the 'ringleaders'.
595. She further mentioned this was an ongoing problem and PC 'A' and PC 'D' were aware of this.
596. At 10.31 am on 3 June 2007 the incident was updated by APS 'I'; '(PC 'D') *to deal with this*'.
597. At 11.01 am the incident was updated '*OIC (PC 'D') has tried contact with caller, no reply, officer will deal over next day, left with OIC to deal*'.
598. At 11.22 am the incident was closed as '*ASB rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour*'.
599. In interview PC 'D' confirmed he did deal with the report and spoke with Fiona Pilkington about it on the telephone either on 4 or 5 June 2007.
600. He stated Fiona Pilkington told him, something on the lines of, '*they were smoking in the drive way*' but although she had named two youths on the incident as the 'ringleaders', she could not say for definite who it was as it had been too dark.
601. PC 'D' referred again to an entry within his diary (which he used as a things to-do list) for the 5 June 2007 which read as follows:

'WIST meeting 11am, See (Mr. 'HBBC3') re: (named youths). See (Mr. 'HBBC3') about 1240 02/06/2007 Fiona Pilkington.'

'Call Fiona Pilkington back on (number) after speaking to (Mr. 'HBBC3').'

602. PC 'D' could not recollect the details of the conversation with Mr. 'HBBC3', only that they did speak, and as the entry had been crossed out in his diary, this indicated to him he had done it.
603. In interview APS 'I' had no recollection of this incident although the log shows an entry at 10.31 am where he had tasked PC 'D' to investigate.
604. He clarified he would literally have read the incident, dispatched it and then gone on to the next one, as he could have had anything from one to fifteen incidents to dispatch. If it was a community issue APS 'I' said he would have read the paragraph and then made the decision to allocate that incident to a beat officer.
605. PC 'A' stated he could vaguely recollect this incident and believed he did go round to see Fiona Pilkington, however she could not give him names of the youths. He was on leave from 27 May 2007 to 12 June 2007 and thought Fiona Pilkington had mentioned this to him on his return. He could not recall liaising with PC 'D' over this incident.
606. Fiona Pilkington makes the following note in the diary given to her by Mr. 'HBBC3':

02/06/07

10:56 pm (Named youths) picked up hands full of my loose stones on drive and threw them at my house. They then went to no 57 lit a fag then tried to set fire to fence between our houses.

11:35 pm They went past pulling my hedge to pieces.

In the column marked 'How has it affected you or your family':

'Really cheesed off, can't they just walk down the street without doing anything it seems impossible'.

Finding 52

607. This is another example of an incident log being prematurely closed with no positive result being obtained.

Finding 53

608. It should be noted PC 'D' had dealt with a reported incident at 59 Bardon Road only two months earlier. PC 'D' failed to identify the link which is further highlighted given his failure to send the statement to Mr. 'HBBC3' regarding the incident of 6 April 2007; although it is accepted PC 'D' appeared to have made verbal contact with Mr. 'HBBC3'.

609. Again, the poor communication between PBOs is demonstrated here. Rather than providing an efficient, informed service the PBOs appear to have been working in isolation of each other.

Tuesday 3 July 2007: 8.33 pm

Incident Log 812

610. The police received a phone call from Fiona Pilkington who reported a local girl had come to her house and accused her and her mother of assaulting a child.
611. Fiona Pilkington mentioned PC 'C' had just been to her house to introduce himself, and now the neighbours think she is *'telling the police things'* and asks for police to return as she is facing harassment from neighbours. She further stated the girl *'said they will have to face the consequences'*.
612. At 9.27 pm the incident was updated *'confer with [REDACTED] (PC 'C') he did attend earlier as stated above. He is aware of the issues as this is ongoing problems (sic). He will ring caller back tonight and states the matter is in hand.'* The incident is further noted that as per the officer, the incident could be closed.

613. The incident was then closed as *'ASB neighbour dispute no crime'*.
614. In interview PC 'C' stated during his initial visit to 59 Bardon Road earlier that day, he recalled speaking to the occupant (he assumed to be Fiona Pilkington) and other residents about anti social behaviour and having a general conversation about what youths were doing in Bardon Road.
615. PC 'C' confirmed he had dealt with this incident and remembered he rang Fiona Pilkington after his initial visit earlier in the day and confirmed she was not having any ongoing problems with neighbours. He said they discussed the incident, Fiona Pilkington knew nothing about assaulting a child and neither of them could understand why the girl had visited her.
616. PC 'C' stated he then went round to see the girl and it became apparent there had been a misunderstanding. He could not recollect whether he made contact with Fiona Pilkington again after this.
617. He said he recalled there was no indication given Fiona Pilkington was being specifically targeted or she was upset by any behaviour. PC 'C' stated he did not identify any vulnerability issues at 59 Bardon Road, saying it did not seem any different to other houses he had visited that day in that people were saying the kids were being a nuisance.
618. Regarding the note on the incident that PC 'C' was *'aware of the issues as this was an ongoing problem'*, he stated this referred to anti social behaviour on the beat and was not a direct reference to the Pilkington family.
619. In interview APS 'I' stated he had no knowledge of the above incident although he did have supervisory responsibility for PC 'C' at the time.
620. He went on to say any officer could have approached either him or PS 'F' if they had any concerns over the level of anti social behaviour, although the onus would be on the officer.

Finding 54

621. Despite being a PBO for the Barwell area PC 'C' stated this was his first recollection of dealing with Fiona Pilkington. It appears he had some kind of prior knowledge of anti social behaviour on Bardon Road, hence the reason for him being on Bardon Road that day, however it is concerning PC 'C' appeared to have no background knowledge of the Pilkington family's reported incidents at the time bearing in mind his role.

Tuesday 25 September 2007: 8.30 pm

Incident Log 867

622. The police received a phone call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road, who reported a window had just been broken and this was the third time this had happened. No offender was seen.
623. At 8.42 pm the log was updated '*... This is an ongoing problem and the victim and neighbours are too frightened to go out as there are always youths causing nuisance and harassment, have ASBO's. Please send officers to visit victim*'.
624. At 8.49 pm the incident was further updated; '*person reporting is currently living with the owner of the house, Fiona Pilkington ... She is living with her as Fiona is now too frightened. It appears as though the local youths are running the area and making residents lives a misery. Victim told me they feel nothing ever gets done*'.
625. The incident was deferred until 26 September due to lack of resources and at 4.16 pm that day the incident was updated '*Crime number SH/03939/07-6*' and [REDACTED] (PCSO 'UU') - *have crimed and are dealing*'.
626. At 4.17 pm the incident was closed as '*crime/criminal damage*'.
627. In his statement PCSO 'UU' [REDACTED] describes how he was on duty from 7.00 am to 4.00 pm on 26 September 2007 and how he was contacted by APS 'I' via his radio and informed of this incident.

628. He states he went to 59 Bardon Road and although he could find no damage to any window, he did conduct house to house enquiries as detailed on the crime report however due to lack of evidence he was unable to progress the investigation any further.
629. PCSO 'UU' recalled the family were upset, not crying, but saying words to the effect that *'this always happens and the police don't do anything and that they never see the police on the street'*. In his opinion he considered them to be *'anti-police'*.
630. He also stated he recalled telling the family this was the first incident he was aware of involving them.
631. The crime report had been generated by the Crime Bureau and as well as noting the report of the broken window, it also included details of anti social behaviour as recorded on the incident log.
632. PCSO 'UU' stated he completed a working sheet within the crime report but there is no reference to him dealing with any other issue raised except for the 'broken' window.
633. In interview APS 'I' confirmed he could have tasked PCSO 'UU' however he had no recollection of it and did not recollect seeing the crime report.
634. PS 'G' was also asked about this incident as he had also completed a working sheet within the crime report.
635. In interview PS 'G' confirmed he also tasked PCSO 'UU' to undertake the investigation and his instructions were clear on the crime report, albeit he did not recollect the incident. He said this tasking was in line with the management position that PCSOs should be included in this type of investigation to use them to their full potential.
636. PS 'G' confirmed as far as he was concerned, the appropriate action had been taken, particularly as he must have known at the time Environmental Action Week was going on in the area which would encompass these kinds of incidents.

637. He explained Environmental Action Week was a week long activity where officers from the Neighbourhood Team in company with other agencies jointly approached the neighbourhood focusing on the areas where the most problems had been identified.
638. Although PS 'G' offered several explanations regarding what action may have been taken following this incident, this was mainly supposition as he could not actually recollect what had actually taken place.
639. Fiona Pilkington made the following note:
- '8:30 pm. 25/09/07'*
- 'Kids wearing dark clothing, 6 – 8 kids, (named youths). Sick and tired of it. Friday night 21/09/07 started presumably bored at not having police round. I didn't report it because after a while it just seems ridiculous they are after attention but busting my windows just isn't fun. It's a school holiday soon and Halloween. I don't have much at all to do with them. Depressed. Hassassed (sic). Fed up. (SH3939076). Fri/Sat 10:30pm till 2am. Kids may still be about. All we get is need more evidence. Can't take photo's, videos, CCTV coz it can only be used at front door only. '*
640. The investigation has been unable to establish if any police officer gave Fiona Pilkington the advice to take photos or videos.

Finding 55

641. The action taken by PCSO 'UU' is seen as adequate regarding the report of the broken window and the decision by PS 'G' to sign off the report is understandable given his knowledge of the area and the lack of evidence. However, there is no evidence to suggest the anti social behaviour issues Fiona Pilkington was also reporting had been addressed.
642. PCSO 'UU's response, this was the first incident involving the family he was aware of is telling, and again is evidence of the lack of

communication within the beat team.

643. Although the information recorded on both the incident log and crime report stating the youths had 'ASBOs' was incorrect, there is nothing recorded to suggest this was clarified or that any possible breaches were acted upon or reported to the council.
644. APS 'I' did not identify this was now the fourth incident in a short space of time on Bardon Road.

Wednesday 26 September 2007: 9.13 pm

Incident Log 774

645. The police received a phone call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road, who reported a gang of 14 to 17 year old youths (named as A1, A2, A3 and I1) throwing things at her window.
646. At 9.17 pm the incident was updated '*is a regular occurrence*', further stating she thought they had now moved away.
647. Officers were assigned at 9.19 pm and at 9.28 pm the incident was updated '*couple of kids around. Have advised them. Ensured 59 saw our presence*'. The incident was closed as '*ASB rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour*'.

Finding 56

648. This was the second call in 24 hours of a similar incident and there was no linking of the incidents that could have lead to a more proactive police, or multi agency, response. Officers do not appear to have even spoken to Mrs. Cassell, despite her stating this was a 'regular occurrence'.
649. Again this was dealt with as an isolated incident and there is no evidence to suggest the council were informed, despite the youths being named on the incident, and again the opportunity to ensure a more proactive response to tackle the youths' behaviour was lost.

Friday 28 September 2007: 8.22 pm

Incident Log 795

650. The police received a phone call from Fiona Pilkington who reported she had just had a window smashed by a group of five youths and this was the fifth time that week this had happened.
651. At 8.26 pm this incident was linked to incident 867 (25 September 2007) and at 8.28 pm it was also linked to incident 774 (26 September 2007).
652. An officer was assigned at 8.29 pm and at 8.33 pm the log was updated; *'have spoken to the comp (complainant), window not broken, knows all the lads involved, but there are no witnesses to the throwing of the stones'*.
653. At 9.04 pm the incident was further updated; *'have been and spoken with caller, no damage has been caused, she was in fear of damage being caused, caller has given us various names of yths that regularly cause her problems, we have spoken with various yths in the street and advised them, also done a door knock with one of the named and spoken with his father, have also advised him, updated caller and she is happy with result'*.
654. At 9.06 pm the incident was closed as *'ASB rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour'*.

Finding 57

655. This was now the third call in four days and again despite the incidents now being linked and officers being given names of youths who 'regularly cause (Fiona Pilkington) problems' no collation of incidents is made to allow an effective and considered response.
656. None of the last three incidents were dealt with by a PBO and due to the lack of internal recording and research by the beat team, it does not appear any of these incidents were brought to the attention of the

council to enable any escalation of the anti social behaviour action that had commenced (this action is covered later in this report at paragraph 723).

Thursday 4 October 2007: 7.57 pm

Incident Log 767

657. The police received a phone call from Mrs. Cassell at 59 Bardon Road, who reported a named youth (A1) had ridden past the house on his bike and was seen to throw a stone at the window. She stated although no damage had been caused on this occasion, this was the sixth stone to hit the window in the last five days.
658. At 8.01 pm the incident was updated there was no resource available to attend.
659. At 8.03 pm the incident is noted *'transfer to desk in case officer in area, otherwise needs to be passed to local PBO for dealing as is ongoing problem'*.
660. At 8.06 the incident was updated *'E mail sent to beat team'* and the incident was closed as *'ASB rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour'*.

Finding 58

661. No officer interviewed could recall being allocated this incident to deal with. This is another example of failings around the allocation and closing of incidents.
662. This is against a background of the caller stating this was the sixth stone to hit the window in the last five days and the log specifying this was an ongoing problem.
663. Despite PC 'A's email back in March 2007 saying he would 'monitor the situation', there is no evidence to suggest any proactive action was taken by the beat team to indeed 'monitor' the situation or deal with any of the reported incidents from September onwards.

Parish Council Meeting

20 September 2007

664. On 20 September 2007 there was a Barwell Parish Council meeting which was attended by Inspector 'L' and PC 'C'. Several local residents were also in attendance.
665. During this meeting the problems with anti social behaviour on Bardon and Bradgate Road, Barwell were brought up by local residents.
666. Although not directly related to incidents involving the Pilkington family it has been included here due to the presence of officers and the discussions around anti social behaviour said to have taken place.
667. Inspector 'L' stated he went to these meetings as the figure head of the Local Policing Unit and reiterated the person he took with him would know the finer detail of the neighbourhood and would often have been a PBO or PCSO. On this occasion he confirmed it was PC 'C'.
668. He said he could not recall what the anti social behaviour issues being raised by the residents were at this meeting nor could he recall who he spoke to and what was said. However he confirmed he would have expected any issues that had arisen at the meeting to have been followed up by PC 'C'.
669. PC 'C' could recall attending a meeting with Inspector 'L' and speaking about how they were tackling anti social behaviour, but stated he could not recollect any further details. He said could not recall any conversations with Inspector 'L' following this meeting around the issues raised.
670. It should be noted on 29 October 2007, six days after the death of Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick, PC 'C' wrote a detailed statement with regard to anti social behaviour being suffered by another family in Bardon Road.
671. Within the statement he confirmed he was made aware of the level of

anti social behaviour being suffered by residents of Bardon Road. As a result he identified a number of youths as responsible for the majority of this behaviour and cross referenced them to a number of reported incidents.

672. Three of those incidents directly related to incidents reported by Fiona Pilkington and her family.

Statements

Mrs. Pamela Cassell

673. In a statement made to the police on 30 October 2007 Fiona Pilkington's mother, Mrs. Cassell, states *'Fiona had reported a number of incidents to the Police and to the local council due to the local children either bullying [REDACTED] (Mrs. Cassell's grandson) or Frankie or incidents that were being encountered at Fiona's home address' and 'it seemed like these things happened on an almost daily basis'.*
674. She said Fiona had told her *'she had had enough of phoning the council and the Police' and 'Fiona felt as though those agencies would not do anything anyway'.*
675. In a statement made to the IPCC on 17 March 2010, Mrs. Cassell said *'Fiona first started having problems around 1996. Frankie had severe learning difficulties and other children on Bardon Road would make fun of her and taunt her'.*
676. She said *'in 2003 due to the harassment I moved in with Fiona. I stayed for four years and in this time I witnessed groups of children throwing stones at the windows, urinating on the side of the house, walking on the top of the hedge. With regards to the hedge incident it was a beautiful sunny Sunday and Fiona had her curtains drawn. When I asked why she told me the Police had told her to draw her curtains so she could not see them walking on the hedge'.*
677. When police officers did attend Fiona Pilkington's home address, Mrs.

Cassell said *'I don't think that any of the Police who attended Fiona's would have met Frankie or [REDACTED] (Mrs. Cassell's grandson) because Fiona did not tell them and they were either in bed or at school when the Police called. I do not know if Fiona told them she had children in the house, but there were pictures of them out'. She said Fiona 'was always composed and would not get upset or cry in front of them, and she would only tell them about the incident she had rung them about. I do not remember the Police ever asking about previous incidents or Fiona's family set up. For every incident that Fiona called the Police there were probably five or six incidents which led up to it. Fiona would have dates, times and names written down to show the Police and would explain herself clearly to the Police. I do not remember the Police ever telling me or Fiona what they intended to do or what they had done'.*

678. Mrs. Cassell recalls Mr. 'HBBC3' visiting and giving Fiona a diary to complete but said Fiona kept her own notes, saying *'I do not think that Fiona ever gave any of her notes of incidents to the Police but I think Fiona once said to them that it was all noted if they wanted to read them, I don't think the Police did though'.*
679. Mrs. Cassell describes how Fiona was worried about Francecca (Frankie) and how she thought *'that this and the constant harassment just got too much for her. It was relentless and she did not think that anyone would help her'.*
680. She said *'Fiona knew that because the trouble children knew Fiona had reported them to the Police, she was going to be a higher target' and she felt 'Fiona was just brushed aside and classed as an attention seeker by the Police and Social Services and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council'.*

'A Local Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator'

681. 'A local Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator' [REDACTED], stated Fiona Pilkington and Mrs. Cassell

would try and attend local Neighbourhood Watch meetings where the local youths who were causing problems for residents were discussed however *'neither Fiona or Pam (Mrs. Cassell) would speak about the problems they were having – I think they were too scared to'*. She also stated *'either (PC 'C') or PCSO ('PP') would attend the Neighbourhood Watch meetings'*.

682. As seen on the incidents in 2007, the 'Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator' was aware of the issues Fiona Pilkington had with local youths and had on occasion reported incidents to the police on Fiona Pilkington's behalf. In her statement she said *'between 2005 and 2007 I would receive a call from Fiona every other day, mainly at weekends. She would often be distressed and in tears complaining about the local youths. I would ask Fiona if she had phoned the Police but she would often say they don't want to know'*.
683. She recalled a Parish Council meeting that took place some time in 2007 which was attended by PC 'C' and Inspector 'L'. The 'Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator' recalls this meeting was attended by other local residents and the issue of anti social behaviour was brought up in the presence of these officers. She stated Fiona Pilkington, Mrs. Cassell, Francecca and Fiona Pilkington's son were also at this meeting however the investigation has been unable to corroborate this.
684. The 'Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator' stated *'the Police Officers said they were looking at ASB and were putting plans in place. They offered to discuss the residents concerns outside of the meeting and their discussions with residents continued in a separate area of the centre'*. The 'Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator' however did not take part in the ensuing discussions with the officers.
685. Due to problems the 'Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator' was also having with local youths, she was in contact with police officers; *'mainly with (PC 'C'), PCSO ('PP') and PCSO ('UU'). I did mention Fiona's*

problems to these Officers and I know PC 'C' did go round to see Fiona'.

686. During interview PC 'C' stated although he knew the 'Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator' he could not recall attending any Neighbourhood Watch meetings, neither could he recall any conversation with her about the Pilkington family.

Chairman of Barwell Parish Council

687. [REDACTED] had been Chairman of Barwell Parish Council since May 2007, and he also attended the Parish Council meeting in 2007 as referred to by the 'Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator'.
688. He was more specific around the date of the meeting and described how *'on 20 September 2007 the Barwell Parish Council meeting was attended by (Inspector 'L') and (PC 'C'). Eleven members of the public were in attendance and of these, eight were residents of the Bardon and Bradgate Road area I recall commenting to Inspector ('L') that this attendance was quite unprecedented. Never before had a deputation attended a meeting and then returned to ensure their concerns were heard by the appropriate authority'.*
689. Although he could not name any of the residents who attended the meeting, he also recalled the residents going into a separate area to discuss matters with Inspector 'L'.

A 'Local Resident'

690. [REDACTED], a 'local resident', confirmed her attendance at the Parish Council meeting in September 2007 and also the issue of local youths on Bradgate Road and Bardon Road was discussed.
691. She could recall PC 'C' was in attendance and he also visited her house at a later date.
692. She could not recall Fiona Pilkington or Mrs. Cassell attending the meeting.

A 'Neighbour' of Fiona Pilkington

693. As a neighbour of Fiona Pilkington she stated she witnessed several incidents of anti social behaviour against the Pilkington family by local (named) youths.
694. 'This neighbour' also stated she was *'aware that Fiona had contact with ██████████ (Mr. 'HBBC1') and ██████████ (Mr. 'HBBC3') at the Council'* and both of them had visited Fiona Pilkington at her home address at some point.
695. She also recalled *'two Police Officers that had dealings with Fiona and her family concerning the anti-social behaviour, they were ██████████ ██████████ (PC 'A') and ██████████ (PC 'C').* 'The neighbour' also believed PC 'A' attended the meeting at Fiona Pilkington's house with Mr. 'HBBC1'.
696. Despite saying she herself called police to report what local youths were doing to Fiona Pilkington, the investigation has not found any incidents relating to calls from 'this neighbour' that directly relate to the Pilkington family.
697. PC 'C' said he could not recollect 'this neighbour' and stated his only contact with Fiona Pilkington was in relation to the incident on 3 July 2007.
698. PC 'A' stated his only dealing with 'this neighbour' was regarding an unrelated matter.

Police Profile of Bardon Road and Barwell

699. A Leicestershire Constabulary 'Neighbourhood Profile' dated 28 September 2007 for the beat area of Barwell and Earl Shilton (beat S27) provided statistical information about the area compiled by the Neighbourhood Policing team through communication with the community, analysis of police database and information for the previous year. In this instance the author is PC 'C'.

700. Crime statistics are broken down however the section for anti social behaviour in the profile is blank. In interview PC 'C' stated there were problems at the time in obtaining anti social behaviour statistics for analysis.
701. Despite this lack of data, the document recommends three priority areas for targeted police response all relating to anti social behaviour issues – none of which included Bardon Road.
702. The profile also identified three hotspots which were to be treated as microbeats and deal with offences of criminal damage, assault, harassment and theft; again none of the areas identified Bardon Road as a 'hotspot'.
703. During interview Inspector 'K' explained a 'microbeat' would be a designated small area, such as a road or a street, where a problem had been highlighted which would not normally come to anybody's attention.
704. He said General Duties Officers would be assigned a microbeat and had a responsibility to assist the PBOs in tackling the issues identified and would be expected, when they were not dealing with response issues, to help out on that microbeat.
705. A further 'Neighbourhood Profile' dated March 2008, is more comprehensive and this time included data from Leicestershire Constabulary databases to show the level of reported incidents of anti social behaviour in beat area SH27 from April 2007 to December 2007.
706. Five anti social behaviour hotspots were identified in Barwell, one of which was Bardon Road where it was recorded; *'the main type of ASB is rowdy and nuisance behaviour by young people and rowdy and nuisance neighbours'*.
707. Bardon Road also now featured as the second hotspot location for assault and harassment based on crime types analysed between January and December 2007. It reads *'most of these offences take*

place in the street. The age profile of the aggrieved suggests two main generations – young persons around 11-16 years old and persons in their 40s. There are a couple of repeat victims’.

708. Both documents describe the area. This description includes the following: *‘the main problems within the community centre around anti social behaviour and are linked to areas of social deprivation and tenanted accommodation and the village centres. Deprivation locations in Barwell are in Church Lane, Bardon Road, Bradgate Road ...’.*
709. The later Profile also includes *‘the area has been recognised at County level as a Priority Beat which gives the team a dedicated Sergeant and generally improves the area’s status in terms of bidding for assistance from other internal departments and external agencies’.*

Problem Solving Plans

710. Problem Solving Plans were documents compiled by PBOs who had recognised a problem on their beat. Those problems covered a wide range of offences and behaviours and were identified mainly by community engagement.
711. According to the officers interviewed, there could only be three Problem Solving Plans at any one time per beat area and they would generally remain effective for six months.
712. In order for a more cohesive approach to be taken in any given area, the PBOs had to identify an issue or problem and submit a Problem Solving Plan. The plan would provide a detailed review of the problem and how it was to be dealt with.
713. A number of Problem Solving Plans were put in place in 2006 and 2007 by various officers however the research undertaken did not identify Bardon Road as a problem area which warranted a higher police response.
714. All of the Problem Solving Plans seen show a coordinated action plan had been drawn up to effectively combat the identified area of concern.

715. None of the officers interviewed or spoken to during this investigation considered Bardon Road to be an area which was suffering from what they considered to be high levels of anti social behaviour.
716. The officers instead stated anti social behaviour in the centre of Barwell village, known locally as 'Top Town', was being actively targeted by local officers as this was considered to be the main 'hotspot' for anti social behaviour in the Barwell area.
717. Tackling anti social behaviour in 'Top Town' has been a consistent feature in the Problems Solving Profiles compiled for the Barwell area.

IPCC Research

718. Research undertaken by the investigation using data supplied by Leicestershire Constabulary indicated between 1 April 2004 and 24 October 2007:
- There were 24 calls from either Fiona Pilkington or calls made on her behalf.
 - 22 of those calls can be classed as anti social behaviour (using the Home Office definition).
 - That level of calls equates to 7.7% of all calls from Bardon Road.
719. The above research was compiled by using the Insight database maintained by Leicestershire Constabulary which could be accessed by all officers subject to investigation.
720. The IPCC report, based on the statistics provided, appeared to show Bardon Road and in particular Fiona Pilkington was suffering from a level of anti social behaviour which should have been identified. The full document can be found in the appendices to this report.

Finding 59

721. It is difficult to say whether the increased content of the March 2008 Neighbourhood Profile was, in part, a reaction to the death of Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick. This Profile was more informative

and did identify Bardon Road now as a 'hot spot' area for anti social behaviour.

722. It is unfortunate the statistical data, which when analysed clearly showed there was a problem with both anti social behaviour and assault and harassment on Bardon Road, was not compiled at more frequent intervals. This may have enabled a more targeted response by Leicestershire Constabulary to the incidents reported on Bardon Road.

Multi Agency Approach

723. As detailed by Mr. 'HBBC3' at Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council in his statement, the mindset at the time was to deal with anti social behaviour through an incremental programme of a four tier system to address the behaviour:
- 1) Advisory letter
 - 2) Warning letter
 - 3) Anti Social Behaviour Contract (ABC)
 - 4) Anti Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) or other civil litigation.
724. This process was also reflected in the Leicestershire Constabulary policy 'An incremental approach to Anti Social Behaviour' which is referred to further on in this report.
725. Following contact between Mr. 'HBBC3' and Fiona Pilkington in February 2007, anti social behaviour letters were sent out to all the youths who had been named by Fiona Pilkington as causing her problems (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2, E1 and F1).
726. Further incidents of anti social behaviour were reported by Fiona Pilkington in April 2007 and as a result additional letters were sent out to the youths in two of those families (A2 and C1).
727. Of the five families involved, the initial letters appeared to have had the desired effect in two families (E1 and F1) and Acceptable Behaviour

Contracts were signed by two others in June 2007 (B1, B2, C1 and C2).

728. One family in particular (family 'A' – youths A1 and A2) were not engaging with the council or housing department and did not sign Acceptable Behaviour Contracts until January 2008. Family 'A' and one of the families who signed their contracts in June 2007, family 'B', were referred to Weekly Information Sharing and Tasking Forum (cases 74 – family A and 78 – family B).

Weekly Information Sharing and Tasking Forum (WIST)

729. A Weekly Information Sharing and Tasking Forum, known as WIST, was a multi agency initiative which had been set up around 2006 to try to overcome the problems of information sharing and to build confidence and personal contacts on all sides within the Hinckley area.
730. WIST comprised mainly of Police, Council and Housing Association representatives with other agencies being invited where it was deemed appropriate (e.g. Social Services). At these meetings information was given and exchanged, and they were attended by a number of the officers mentioned in this report on a regular basis in their capacity as Neighbourhood Officers.
731. The focus of the WIST meetings appeared to be one where problem families and local anti social behaviour issues were discussed and action plans put into place to deal with those causing the problems. It was chaired by a police officer, usually a Sergeant.
732. In 2007 PS 'F' stated he took over being Chair of the WIST meetings from PS 'E' as there was a long standing agreement the Sergeant responsible for neighbourhood policing would be the Chair of the meeting.
733. PS 'E' stated he left his role at Hinckley in approximately June 2007 however, he is shown as attending the WIST meeting on 10 July 2007. PS 'F' in all probability took over chairing the meetings shortly after this

date.

734. The focus at this time was on dealing with the youths involved through either the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Community Safety Team or the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Housing Department, particularly if the 'offenders' were council tenants.
735. It should be noted the youths identified as responsible for the anti social behaviour suffered by Fiona Pilkington were living in local authority or housing association properties, but Fiona Pilkington was an owner occupier.
736. The focus of the WIST meeting was on offenders and there was little, if any, focus on the victims of the outlined behaviour.
737. In 2007 at these meetings local youths were discussed due to their behaviour in Bardon Road. These were some of the youths named by Fiona Pilkington in recent reports made to the police and the council.
738. There were two case files opened following WIST meetings which directly related to incidents of anti social behaviour around the Bardon Road area, case 74 (believed to be in April 2007) and another a short time later, case 78 (believed to be in May 2007) .
739. Case 74 mentioned another family on Bardon Road who were being 'targeted', however neither case file contained reference to Fiona Pilkington, although the families referred to were also those who had been identified as carrying out the anti social behaviour / harassment of Fiona Pilkington and her family.
740. Despite PC 'D' stating he had raised the Pilkington family during one meeting and he had spoken to Mr. 'HBBC3' prior to the meeting and also the contact with the Pilkington family by both the council and police, Mr. 'HBBC3' confirmed in his statement neither Fiona Pilkington or her family were discussed at any WIST meetings and none of the officers interviewed could recall her being mentioned.
741. PC 'A' stated he did not bring up Fiona Pilkington and her family at the

WIST meetings because he did not feel she had experienced anything more than anyone else in Barwell or Earl Shilton and it was not something that had been identified as a major problem. He did not know if he brought up family 'A'.

742. The minutes of the WIST meeting for 17 April 2007 confirm both PS 'E' and PC 'A' were present but neither appear to have mentioned the fact PC 'A' had recently visited Fiona Pilkington following her letter via David Tredinnick MP and he was supposed to be 'monitoring' the situation.
743. The minutes of the WIST meeting for 24 April 2007 confirm PS 'E', PC 'A' and PC 'D' were all present and although the family 'A' was mentioned again (as above on 17 April), no link was made to the reports made by Fiona Pilkington despite PC 'D' conducting an investigation following the report made on 6 April which involved a youth from that family (A2).
744. It should be noted this was the incident when PC 'D' failed to submit a statement to Mr. 'HBBC3'.
745. The minutes of the WIST meeting of 5 June 2007 confirm PS 'E' and PC 'D' were present but there is no record within the minutes to suggest the incident reported by Fiona Pilkington on 2 June (incident 1240), which PC 'D' responded to, was discussed.
746. There is a record of youths in family 'A' being mentioned as again causing problems in Bardon Road but the link is not made by any officer or if it was, nobody could recall it and there is no evidence to support a more robust or escalating response by either the police or the council.
747. The minutes of WIST meetings show family 'A' is mentioned on a weekly basis. The entries confirm the family were uncooperative and not engaging with either of the council representatives - this is further supported in the statements of the Housing Officer and Mr. 'HBBC3'.

748. Despite several weeks of documenting family 'A' being uncooperative, in the WIST minutes of 24 July 2007 the 'action' simply reads 'all to monitor'.
749. A schedule was produced by the investigation detailing the period of time taken in implementing either Anti Social Behaviour warning letters or Acceptable Behaviour Contracts to the youths mentioned in the WIST meetings and by Fiona Pilkington directly to the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
750. Mr. 'HBBC3' did visit Fiona Pilkington following her call direct to the council in February 2007 and he did write to and meet all the families mentioned by Fiona Pilkington; however he stated his job was to focus on helping offender families and any further ASBO / ABC was the remit of the Housing Department.

Finding 60

751. The WIST meetings are understood to have been set up by Inspector 'K'. The benefits of meetings like WIST are clearly beneficial when relevant information is shared and the issues raised robustly acted upon.

Finding 61

752. The focus of the WIST forum was on the action which could be taken against offenders with no mention of how victims of the behaviour could be helped.
753. The failures by PC 'A' and to a point PC 'D', to inform the WIST group of the individual investigations undertaken by those officers are seen as failed opportunities to establish a coordinated approach to deal with the anti social behaviour directed towards the Pilkington family.
754. There were also failures by PS 'E' and PS 'F' to ensure a proactive response was taken and progress made, especially in relation to the youths in family 'A'.

Finding 62

755. [REDACTED]

756. Although the ABC letters were the responsibility of the council, the police were a partner agency and there is no evidence to suggest the police queried the council or housing department's perceived lack of a robust response.

Legislation

757. During the period 2004 and 2007 there were a number of legislative options and local policies for officers to follow with regard to combating Anti Social Behaviour.

- Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- Protection from Harassment Act 1997
- Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003
- Offences Against the Person Act 1861
- Criminal Damage Act 1971
- Public Order Act 1986

758. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 defines Anti Social Behaviour as:

A person acting in a manner which causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself.

759. The Harassment Act 1997 defines harassment as:

A person whose course of conduct is in question ought to know that it amounts to harassment of another if a reasonable person in possession of the same information would think the course of conduct

amounted to harassment of the other.

760. On two occasions youths responsible for the harassment / anti social behaviour / assaults against Fiona Pilkington / Fiona Pilkington's son were issued harassment warnings under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.
761. Action can be taken under the Act when conduct by an individual/s which constitutes harassment occurs on at least two occasions. It should be noted the period of time between the two incidents is not defined.
762. The statement of Superintendent 'VV' as Head of the Criminal Justice Department clearly details the actions that could have been taken against criminal offenders. However, it does also confirm the levels of evidence required to pursue such an action.
763. Superintendent 'VV' further outlined at the relevant time Leicestershire Constabulary had a policy to deal with juveniles in a proportionate manner without recourse to prosecutions where possible.
764. During the period 2004 - 2007 the preferred course of action was to deal with the offenders, as outlined in the Operation Teak report, by way of reprimands or final warnings based on mitigating factors.

Finding 63

765. A number of officers and documents use the term 'harassment warning' when dealing with incidents and the recording of actions taken. There is no such warning specified in the Harassment Act 1997 however this is a term often used by officers to 'record' an initial incident of harassment.
766. The recording of these 'warnings' by officers was not easily accessible on Leicestershire Constabulary's databases.
767. The incidents reported by Fiona Pilkington in 2007 which could have constituted harassment were not linked to the earlier 'warnings' given in 2004 and therefore subsequent instances of harassment against the

family by the same individuals were not linked.

Finding 64

768. Although complaints of a criminal nature were made, the investigation of these complaints was inadequate.

Leicestershire Constabulary Policies and Procedures – 2004 to 2007

769. This section covers the systems, procedures, policies and legislation which were in place during the period February 2004 to October 2007.

Leicestershire Constabulary Anti Social Behaviour ‘Incremental Approach’ Policy

Effective date 8 May 2007

770. This policy deals with the options available to officers and details the staged procedure to adopt when tackling anti social behaviour in partnership with local authority anti social behaviour teams as follows:
- 1) Advice Letter - The initial stage of the process which involves a letter being issued to the perpetrator/s to ‘advise’ them a complaint about their behaviour has been made. This is for the lowest levels of anti social behaviour.
 - 2) Warning Letter – More accusatory than an ‘advice’ letter it is likely the behaviour of the perpetrator is more serious and more evidence is usually available.
 - 3) Acceptable Behaviour Contract (ABC) – The contract should specify the acts of anti social behaviour committed and is a *voluntary* agreement signed by the perpetrator not to continue those acts.
 - 4) Anti Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) and Criminal Anti Social Behaviour Order (CRASBO) – An ASBO is a legal intervention applied for through the courts and should only be considered when the other measures (letters, ABC) have failed or the offending is so serious an ASBO is deemed the appropriate measure. A CRASBO is effectively

the same as an ASBO but is linked to criminal proceedings.

771. This policy was valid in May 2007 although there is evidence officers were aware of this system and it was being utilised before this date. This action is mirrored by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council as detailed in the statement of Mr. 'HBBC3'.
772. The policy clearly states once an Anti Social Behaviour Advice or Warning letter is issued, *'a CIS intelligence log should be completed to ensure it is recorded against the persons nominal'* and is therefore searchable. It should also be recorded on a CIS intelligence log, where Acceptable Behaviour Contracts have been issued, stating whether 'ABC signed' or 'ABC refused'.
773. The policy concentrates on addressing the behaviour of offenders; it offers no guidance on supporting the victims of anti social behaviour with the exception of how to treat them as witnesses contained within the section on Anti Social Behaviour Order Procedure.
774. This section suggests because as witnesses will probably be known to the offenders they may be reluctant to come forward, and advised using other agencies such as 'Leicester Witness Cocoon' or Victim Counselling and Support Service to support witness.
775. In relation to Anti Social Behaviour Orders, PS 'F' stated the legislation was there but time was a problem. He said they had to be dealing with five to six incidents a month before they could obtain one and it was very hard to prove. He explained they had to evidence this and get statements off victims to describe what issues they were experiencing and some people were not willing to give the police that information.

Finding 65

776. Intelligence logs on CIS were not completed with details of the Warning letters or ABC Contracts issued to the youths by the council, despite officers being aware this had been done. The police therefore had no searchable record or audit trail of this action being taken.

777. There is no evidence to suggest the police referred the Pilkington family to any victim support group which may have assisted them to cope with the anti social behaviour / harassment.

Leicestershire Constabulary Anti Social Behaviour Orders Policy and Protocol

Effective date January 2000

778. The policy details the procedures to follow when a decision has been made to make an application for an anti social behaviour order.
779. Although prior to the introduction of warning letters and contracts as documented above, this policy does state it would be necessary to record evidence of previous attempts to reconcile the anti social behaviour.
780. It makes reference to initiatives of challenges, warnings, mediation and injunctions to support the victims of anti social behaviour.

Finding 66

781. Where discussed, the officers interviewed stated actually obtaining an anti social behaviour order was, and still is, a long and difficult process.
782. There is no evidence to suggest an application for an anti social behaviour order was made in relation to any of the youths prior to the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick.

Leicestershire Constabulary Anti Social Behaviour Officer

783. In her statement, taken by the IPCC, PC 'ASB' detailed between June 2005 and October 2007 she was the anti social behaviour officer for the area of Hinckley and Bosworth; which included Barwell.
784. PC 'ASB' stated there were no established definitions for the role and responsibilities of the Anti Social Behaviour Officer, and it was very much '*on the job learning*'.

785. She stated some of the work related to the preparation of ASBOs and CRASBOs, in liaison with other agencies such as the Crown Prosecution Service and Councils, and she would also prepare warning letters and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts.
786. Another element of her role was to check the OIS computer command and control computer system for any listings of anti social behaviour. PC 'ASB' explained the OIS computer system could bring up listings of any reported incident which was given an anti social behaviour tag and she would try and check this on a weekly basis for the entire borough area.
787. PC 'ASB' confirmed she would attend WIST meetings and it was during these meetings she became aware of three particular families who were causing anti social behaviour in the Bardon Road area, but stated she never became aware, and was not notified of any specific family suffering from repeated and prolonged anti social behaviour – this included the Pilkington family.
788. In a later report PC 'ASB' stated between 2004 and 2007 there was no protocol in place between the police and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and it was possible warning letters could have been sent out without the local police knowing. Where she did receive copies of letters issued by the council PC 'ASB' stated she would file them for information purposes.
789. PC 'ASB' also said if local officers (such as PBOs) issued Warning Letters then there was no electronic system they could view to establish if any other such letters had been issued. She did however say her expectation would be for local PBOs to communicate with each other.
790. In interview Inspector 'J' confirmed his expectation of the Anti Social Behaviour Officer in 2004 was in line with the policing objectives which were to identify and deal with anti social behaviour and its links with criminality.

791. As a result Inspector 'J' explained the issues raised by Fiona Pilkington would not have been fed into the work PC 'ASB' was doing as a matter of course, as her work was more to target and identify individuals for CRASBOs rather than ASBOs.
792. Inspector 'K' effectively echoed Inspector 'J's expectations of the role of the force Anti Social Behaviour Officer, adding they were an integral part of the WIST group.
793. He was asked if he expected the Anti Social Behaviour Officer to be informed of *all* incidents of anti social behaviour within the local policing unit, he said no because there were so many of them. He would expect the officer to be informed if there was a particular problem but not every incident.

Finding 67

794. As anti social behaviour was considered a 'non crime' there was no designated recording system in place and as such, the only recording of such reported incidents was dependent on the closing codes used recorded on the OIS logs.
795. However, as PC 'ASB' points out in her statement, where an act of criminal damage occurred it would be recorded as criminal damage on OIS and would not appear on the anti social behaviour lists even if the damage had occurred as a result of anti social behaviour, as the system could not be allocated two categories. Therefore a full picture of anti social behaviour incidents could not be established.

Finding 68

796. The CIS intelligence system was not routinely used to record incidents of reported anti social behaviour.
797. PC 'ASB' stated there was no 'electronic system' to record the issue of warning letters etc however the force's 'Anti Social Behaviour Incremental Approach Policy' clearly states this should be recorded on an intelligence log in CIS.

798. It appears anti social behaviour warning letters and contracts were potentially being issued by the council, the force Anti Social Behaviour Officer and officers themselves without any co-ordinated system in place to monitor what the others were doing. This was against a backdrop of WIST meetings attended by police officers; including a Sergeant on a regular basis.
799. Despite PC 'ASB', PC 'A', PC 'C', PS 'E' and other officers present during WIST meetings all being aware of Warning Letters and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts being issued to youths in relation to Bardon Road, none of them had the foresight to record this information on their own intelligence database, losing the opportunity to gather and share vital information.

Leicestershire Constabulary Police Procedures for Dealing with Hate Crime / Incidents

Effective date 23 October 2007

800. This is the earliest policy provided by Leicestershire Constabulary which deals specifically with hate crime and hate incidents however, the Home Office guidance 'Hate Crime: Delivering a Quality Service' (March 2005) was in circulation prior to 2007 and this recognised persons with disabilities as potential targets for hate crime / incidents.
801. This policy was reviewed by the force in September 2009 and effectively mirrors the previous policy.
802. The policy defines the different factors which could be categorised as a hate crime / incident and the legislative options available to combat instances of hate crime.
803. It should be noted the definition of a hate *incident* is the same now as it was during the period 2004 to 2007 and is detailed in this policy as:
'Any incident, which may or may not constitute a criminal offence, which is perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate'.

804. The definition of a hate *crime* as detailed in the current policy is:
'Any hate incident, which constitutes a criminal offence, perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate'.
805. The difference between the two definitions is a hate incident may not constitute a criminal offence and would not be recorded as a hate crime.
806. The policy gives specific definitions for types of incidents. The definition of a Disability Incident is as follows:
'The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 defines a disability as a 'physical or mental impairment which has substantial and long term adverse effect on an individual's ability to carry out his/her normal day to day activities'.
'Any incident which is perceived to be based upon prejudice towards or hatred of the victim because of their disability or so perceived by the victim or any other person'.
807. The policy states all that is required to record a hate incident is the perception by anyone a hate incident has occurred; an officer can also form the opinion an incident is motivated by hate even if nobody else does (including the victim).
808. There is a checklist included in the policy which outlines the 'minimum standards' expected of police officers / staff when dealing with a hate crime / incident. These standards include an emphasis on not just relying on the victim to state they have been subjected to a hate incident / crime but to use their own judgement.
809. The minimum standards for call handlers / call management centre staff included the need to advise a supervisor and not to place the incident on the 'LPU TQ' *'without the express wishes of the area supervisor'* as this could result in *'incidents remaining un-actioned with a potentially unacceptable delay in the police response'.*

810. The 'LPU TQ' was the incident queue specific to each Local Policing Unit area, known as the 'station queue', monitored by the area Sergeants.

Leicestershire Constabulary Hate Crime Officers

811. The policy entitled Police Procedures for dealing with hate crime/incidents clearly outlines the level of service required for dealing with such incidents and defines the role of the Hate Crime Officer as: Ensuring effective and co-ordinated service to the victims of hate incidents / crime.
812. In 2004 Leicestershire Constabulary implemented the positions of Hate Crime Officers.
813. DC 'HCO1' confirmed in 2004 she undertook the role for the Hinckley area. As it was a new post, she said each person was responsible for developing their role as there were no job descriptions and there was no link up with other Hate Crime Officers within the force at that time. She left this role in 2006.
814. DC 'HCO1', and those who undertook the role after she left (DC 'HCO2' January 2006 to April 2007 and PC 'HCO3' April 2007 to October 2008), confirmed there were no referrals made to them regarding Fiona Pilkington or her family and the system was entirely reliant on officers identifying persons as victims of hate incidents / crime.
815. DC 'HCO1' and DC 'HCO2' stated they had dealt mainly with race hate crime but also homophobic hate crime. PC 'HCO3' also stated this but in addition stated he dealt with religious and faith hate crime. None of these officers said they dealt with disability hate crime and could not recall such a case.
816. When asked whether Fiona Pilkington and her family should have been referred to a Hate Crime Officer on the basis of disability, DC 'HCO1' stated this should have fallen into the category of hate crime, but it was for the officer dealing with the incident to make this recognition.

817. DC 'HCO2' stated it was her understanding any referral would have been made under the vulnerable adult policy, or due to the anti-social behaviour aspect via the CRASBO officer.
818. PC 'HCO3' stated at the time most officers would see the Hate Crime Officer role as dealing with someone from an ethnic background so in theory it could have been referred to a Hate Crime Officer.

National Awareness of Disability as a Hate Crime / Incident

819. Superintendent 'WW' of the Race Confidence and Justice Unit in the Office for Criminal Justice Reform confirms in April 2007 he began research in relation to hate crime with a view to agreeing a common definition of hate crime. He stated he *'found that there was a common agreement that hate crime was broadly accepted to be where a victim was chosen because of a hostility to who they were or how they lived their life'*.
820. Superintendent 'WW' details he found significant confusion in this area regarding which strands of hate crime should be included and the confusion between crimes and incidents.
821. He states prior to November 2007 it was difficult to say which forces recorded disability as part of their hate crime response and although some forces indicated they did record disability, in practice there were very few reports.
822. When he examined available research in 2007 Superintendent 'WW' states he was *'struck by the prevalence of hate crime which targeted people with disabilities particularly those who have a learning disability or mental ill-health'*.
823. In assessing the quality of response to disability hate crime Superintendent 'WW' stated he made contact with a number of Senior Investigating Officers and Prosecutors and found that whilst the standard of investigation and prosecution appeared to be of a high standard, he did not find regular evidence of awareness of the concept

of disability hate crime or of the potential enhanced sentences which were available.

Finding 69

824. Although the Force hate crime / incidents policy effectively did not come into effect until October 2007, it is clear there were officers in place to deal with hate crime incidents within Leicestershire Constabulary since 2004.
825. What is not clear is the emphasis by the force on identifying victims of disability hate crime / incidents.
826. It would appear Leicestershire Constabulary did not incorporate the 'good practice and tactical guidance of the Home Office guidance 'Hate Crime: Delivering a Quality Service' into their own policies until October 2007.

Finding 70

827. Hate Crime Officers at the time appeared to be reliant on the officers dealing with the incidents to recognise the incident they are dealing with is a hate crime / incident and for the incident to be marked accordingly.
828. The Hate Crime Officers themselves seem unsure about the process for referring a disability hate crime / incident so it is unlikely the officers were aware. It appears disability as a factor in hate crime / incidents was just not recognised or considered as an aggravating or sole factor in the incident / crime. The fact it was the children of the household who were the subjects of the harassment, and not Fiona Pilkington herself, may also have been a factor.
829. The research undertaken by Superintendent 'WW' in 2007 demonstrates a national lack of awareness by police forces in recognising people with disabilities, particularly learning disabilities and people with mental health issues, as targets for hate crime / incidents.

Finding 71

830. As the Hate Crime Officers themselves seemed confused by the inclusion of disability as a hate crime / incident and the Force policy did not come into effect until October 2007, it would be unfair to level criticism at any officer for not referring incidents involving the Pilkington family to Hate Crime Officers that could have been classed as hate incidents.
831. To be classed as hate crime, officers needed to establish for themselves Fiona Pilkington and her family were being targeted because of Francecca's disability and Fiona Pilkington's son's learning difficulties.
832. Officers who met the children recognised, or were informed by Fiona Pilkington or Mrs. Cassell, that Fiona Pilkington's son had learning difficulties and those who met Francecca stated her disabilities were evident. However, as even Mrs. Cassell said in her statement, Fiona Pilkington would often meet with police officers when the children were at school and did not mention the children's difficulties to them.

Leicestershire Constabulary Community Engagement and Consultation Strategy

Effective date 22 November 2006

833. The focus of this strategy is around effective neighbourhood policing and engagement with local communities to identify issues which are important to the people in that locality.
834. Within this policy are suggestions on engagement and consultation strategies to assist the Neighbourhood Policing Teams (PBOs were part of those teams), the ethos being; *'Neighbourhood policing means we don't wait for people to tell us what the problems are – we enter the community and actively find problems out and do something about them'*.
835. The Problem Solving Plans are the product of this kind of community

engagement where officers have received feedback from local residents. During interview officers stated they had conducted 'patchwalks' in the Barwell areas, including on Bardon Road, and held 'Have a Say Days' in the Barwell area.

836. Patchwalks involve knocking on doors, completing questionnaires and generally canvassing local opinion on the issues affecting them. 'Have a Say Days' are a similar tool where officers will advertise a time and place for local people to 'Have a Say' on policing priorities.

Finding 72

837. This policy addresses the wider community and the investigation has seen evidence to support the beat team for the Barwell area had been actively engaged in this type of activity, considering priorities and devising action plans to tackle anti social behaviour in 'Top Town'.

Leicestershire Constabulary Crime Reduction and Community Safety

Effective date November 2005

838. This is more a strategy than a policy as it demonstrates an awareness by Leicestershire Constabulary of the effects of anti social behaviour on victims and details its aim of *'improving the service given to victims of crime and anti social behaviour, particularly to those who have previously been victimised or may be vulnerable to repeat victimisation'*.
839. It further recognises the need to prevent crime and that *'repeat victimisation is costly and distressing to the victim and places additional demands on the police'*.

Finding 73

840. Despite recognition by the force in 2005 of the need to address these issues, there was nothing in place to ensure the Pilkington family were considered as vulnerable or as repeat victims. The service provided by

Leicestershire Constabulary to the Pilkington family did not meet their own strategy set out two years before the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francessca Hardwick.

Leicestershire Constabulary Vulnerable and Intimidated Witnesses and Victims Policy

Effective date August 2002

841. This policy details the help, assistance and procedures which should be given and followed to vulnerable and intimidated witnesses (including children) to enable them to gain access to the criminal justice system and to maximise their ability to give evidence in subsequent proceedings.
842. This is the guidance PC 'B' referred to when he made the decision to conduct a video interview with Fiona Pilkington's son due to his age and learning difficulties.

Finding 74

843. This policy deals with vulnerable witnesses but does not offer guidance with the identification of vulnerable people outside of the criminal justice system who were living in wider communities.

Leicestershire Constabulary Information Exchange Protocol

Between Leicestershire Constabulary and Harborough District Council for Anti Social Behaviour, Graffiti, Litter and other associated Crimes

Effective date August 2001

844. The Information Exchange Policy details how liaison should be conducted between Leicestershire Constabulary and Harborough District Council.
845. Although not the council concerned with in this report, this policy details the legal framework around data sharing which was in place in 2001

and demonstrates Leicestershire Constabulary had information sharing protocols of this nature in place with local authorities in order to tackle anti social behaviour prior to 2004.

An Information Sharing Protocol between Leicestershire Constabulary and Victim Support Leicestershire and Rutland

Not dated

- 846. This protocol details the procedure for referring victims of crime to the appropriate support agency.
- 847. On page four of this document it clearly outlines crimes which should have lead to such a referral. Included are Criminal Damage and Assault.
- 848. It should be pointed out, also on page four, referral to Victim Support should be made (where consent has been sought) for 'domestic, homophobic and racist incidents' – incidents involving disability are not mentioned.

Finding 75

- 849. The protocol was not followed as a referral was never made despite reports being made by Fiona Pilkington which included the above offences, although it is accepted the effective date of this protocol is not known.

Leicestershire Constabulary No Secrets - The Protection of Vulnerable Adults (Multi Agency Policy and Procedures)

Effective February 2002

- 850. This policy details the multi agency response to be given to vulnerable adults within the community, with the emphasis on recognising different forms of abuse.
- 851. It defines a vulnerable adult as anyone aged eighteen or over who:

*'Is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and
Is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'.*

852. A further, undated, Leicestershire Constabulary document titled 'Guidance to the Multi Agency Procedures for the Protection of Vulnerable Adults from Abuse' consists of much of the same content as the 'No Secrets' policy.

Finding 76

853. The definition of a vulnerable adult as above would not have described Fiona Pilkington and although Francecca turned eighteen in December 2006, the purpose of this policy would not have been relevant in their situation.

Leicestershire Constabulary Guidelines for Installation and Withdrawal of Domestic Violence, Hate Attack and Autodialler Alarms

Effective date January 2004

854. This policy states the intention of the alarms to be a short term measure, to be reviewed after 28 days or less. This would enable a Grade 1 response by police (immediate response). It also details the procedure to be followed for the installation of an alarm.
855. At no time was consideration given to installing an alarm although notes made by Fiona Pilkington mention she was given advice to film or photograph the offenders.

Finding 77

856. Considering the nature of what Fiona Pilkington was reporting, it is unlikely authorisation would have been given for such an alarm in her case as it appears to be aimed more at persons vulnerable to physical attacks in their own home.

Leicestershire Constabulary Systems and Databases

857. The main systems in use at Leicestershire Constabulary relevant to this investigation were as follows:
- OIS – was the Command and Control system used by Leicestershire Constabulary to record all reported incidents for the period under investigation
 - INSIGHT – was a searchable database of all reported incidents downloaded from the OIS system
 - CIS – was the force Crime and Intelligence System where all crime and intelligence was recorded
 - GENIE – was a locally devised tool that searched multiple force systems to provide a comprehensive summary of data held by the force relating to a particular search field (name, address etc)

OIS

858. Mr. 'CMC1', a Leicestershire Constabulary Control Management Centre Research and Development Officer, explained in his statement the Command and Control system used by Leicestershire Constabulary between 2004 and 2007 was OIS.
859. He said this changed to Vantage around September 2007, however this was still effectively OIS but with a Windows based interface.
860. Inspector 'IUM', the Leicestershire Constabulary Crime and Incident Unit Manager, explained in his statement when an incident is opened on OIS, it must be given an opening code, as outlined in the National Standards of Incident Recording (NSIR). Likewise when an incident is closed, a closing code must also be used.
861. Inspector 'IUM' went on to say between 2004 and 2007, any member of Call Management Centre staff could close incidents on OIS; however call handlers have always only been allowed to close incidents when

there is non attendance by Officers (originally designated as grade 4 incidents), grade 1 and 2 incidents were mainly closed by dispatch desk staff and some grade 3 incidents were closed by the then named Service Delivery Desk (now the Crime and Incident Unit).

862. He mentioned historically, it was possible for some grade 3 incidents to be left open for weeks, often deferred due to no officers being available.
863. Inspector 'IUM' stated incident logs should be updated with a 'result' or 'action taken' before closure and in this respect Leicestershire Constabulary procedure to close an incident had always been the same, however this was not always practiced. He added information could still be added to an incident log even after it has been closed.
864. The closing of incidents without ensuring they had actually been dealt with is an area of concern throughout the report.
865. Between 2004 and 2007 Inspector 'IUM' stated he examined 500 incidents a month, 100 per opening code, and there had always been a system of quality control for incidents – from initial call handling through to closure.
866. He said at that time 'failures' were recorded and brought to the attention of Line Managers and a quarterly report was sent to the Senior Management Team, highlighting his findings.
867. The investigation has established Police Officers not working within the Call Management Centre could not physically close incidents themselves; however they could request an OIS incident be closed via the Call Management Centre.
868. It was also established OIS could only recognise incidents at the same location if they occurred within 20 minutes of each other and as such, would not connect any previous incidents.
869. Of the 28 incidents that have been examined within this report, 15 were closed with anti social behaviour qualifiers.

History Markers/Red Banner Alerts

870. In his statement Mr. 'CMC1' explained History Markers could be placed on the Command and Control system (OIS) within the Call Management Centre if requested by an officer.
871. He said the markers were location, not person, specific and their purpose was to alert officers and staff bringing up that location on the Command and Control system to any relevant history at an address such as domestic violence or concern for officer safety.
872. Any requests for History Markers had to be authorised by the Call Management Centre Inspector and could remain on a location for three months at which point they were reviewed.
873. Mr. 'CMC1' confirmed the Red Banner system was in place when the OIS 'green screen' system was in use and this was replaced by the Text Alert system following the implementation of Vantage (around September 2007) – however they served the same purpose.
874. Unlike History Markers, Red Banner / Text Alerts were not limited to location only and requests could be made for a number of reasons; alerts for beat priorities were a common request.
875. He explained they could trigger a worded alert to the user of the Command and Control system when a new incident is created or an existing incident amended whenever certain selected words were typed.
876. He gave the example if anti-social behaviour was being targeted at a certain location a request could be made for a specifically worded alert to appear whenever a combination of words or parts of words were typed onto the incident (e.g. the search criteria may be set as 'anti', 'ASB', 'Barwell').
877. He researched the Command and Control System and could find only one History Marker for 59 Bardon Road following the deaths of Fiona

Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick, dated 24 October 2007.

878. He also confirmed there was no Red Banner or Text Alerts for Barwell.
879. Mr. 'CMC1' details the procedure and process required to request a History Marker or Red Banner / Text Alert in his statement.
880. During his interview PC 'B' mentioned he was asked whether he should have put history on the address by the Operation Teak team [REDACTED] and he had told them no, not at that particular time.
881. PC 'B' said Force policy at the time stated it had to be a serious and significant incident/s before a History Marker would even be considered; 'serious risk to life and limb' not for anti social behaviour.
882. PC 'A' stated he did not consider putting a History Marker on 59 Bardon Road as he did not feel there was any jeopardy to the safety of Fiona Pilkington and there were no alarm bells that it was needed.

Finding 78

883. If officers attending the incidents on Bardon Road had utilised the History Maker / Red Banner alert process then the continued level of anti social behaviour suffered by Fiona Pilkington and her family could have been more easily identified by officers dealing with the reported incidents and robustly tackled.

INSIGHT

884. PC 'IP', an officer seconded to Leicestershire Constabulary's IMPACT Programme (which looks at how the police service manages information), explained in his statement Insight 2 was a searchable database which took its information from the Command and Control system (OIS / Vantage) by downloading it every 90 minutes.
885. Insight 2 is the current system used by Leicestershire Constabulary. PC 'IP' explained it was a development of Insight 1; which he believed was in place between 2001 and 2008.

886. He confirmed both systems performed the same basic function and Insight 2 held six years worth of searchable data.
887. Insight was a database which could be used by officers to search for and view incidents.
888. Inspector 'J' stated during interview his expectation of the PBOs, at the time he was the Local Policing Unit Commander, was for them to use Insight to understand what the problems and issues were on their beat as this was a PBOs 'tool' in terms of understanding what happened over a period of time in a location.
889. PS 'E' also mentioned Insight during interview and described it in 2004 as a 'primitive' very early day recording system he could use to look at incidents.
890. He explained how he used Insight as a search tool saying he could put a code in for say 'criminal damage', and he could look at where the criminal damage patterns were. PS 'E' did not think there was a code for anti social behaviour.

CIS

891. Leicestershire Constabulary's Crime and Intelligence system (CIS) was a searchable system used by officers to record crimes and intelligence between 2004 and 2007; it was frequently used by officers and is still in use.
892. Crime reports are allocated to a specific officer and on completion are filed by a supervising officer. This is all recorded on the system.
893. No intelligence logs were created in relation to the Pilkington family or the youths being complained about during the time period being examined in this report.
894. This report has already made note of the crime reports relevant to the Pilkington family in 2004 and 2007 as recorded on CIS and as such the remainder of this section concentrates on the crime rather than

intelligence side of CIS.

Harassment Warnings

895. The investigation has found the recording of those persons given harassment warnings as detailed within the crime reports for 3 July 2004 and 28 July 2004, although in accordance with national guidelines on the recording of crime, made it very difficult for officers to conduct any subsequent meaningful research. This was particularly so if the officer in the case did not make a separate entry on the intelligence side of the CIS database.
896. To actually discover the facts around the incident officers would have had to review the working sheets behind the reports which could be time consuming.
897. In addition, those persons issued with harassment warnings are recorded along side the victim of the behaviour as an 'aggrieved' party and not an 'offender' or 'suspect'. It was explained by Inspector 'J' this was because they were not an offender or suspect as they had not been convicted or cautioned of a criminal offence. He stated you would have to interrogate the system to find out who had received a harassment warning previously.

Repeat Victims

898. When a crime report was generated there was a facility to record whether the victim was a 'repeat' victim.
899. The Leicestershire Constabulary definition of repeat victimisation is: *'Repeat victimisation occurs when the same person or place suffers from more than one incident within Leicestershire over the preceding 12 months'*. This definition was applicable in 2003 and is still current.
900. The three crime reports completed in 2004, one by PC 'B' and two by PC 'D', all recorded Fiona Pilkington's son was a 'repeat victim'. Although, somewhat confusingly, one of the youths in crime report WH/04428/04-7 was also recorded as a 'repeat victim' by PC 'D'.

901. In 2007 the crime report completed by PC 'D' in respect of Fiona Pilkington's son did not record him as a repeat victim. However, it appears this was initially completed by somebody else and it should be noted the address is incorrect stating Bardon Road, Coalville not Bardon Road, Barwell.
902. The crime report, also in 2007, completed by PCSO 'UU' in relation to stones being thrown at her windows, did record Fiona Pilkington as a 'repeat victim'.
903. PS 'CIS', the Leicestershire Constabulary CIS Administrator and Service Improvement Officer, stated the CIS system used to have an option when a repeat victim was identified a trigger would automatically be generated to alert the appropriate department.
904. He believed the appropriate department would have been the Vulnerable Victim Unit or the Crime Desk Group (if it was a crime) but he could not be sure of this. He made enquiries to find out whether there was a record of when the repeat victim trigger was disabled but unfortunately no records were kept.
905. PS 'CIS' stated instead of the repeat victim options they now use vulnerability as an identifying factor and dependent on why the person is vulnerable will depend on who is alerted e.g. Hate Crime Officers, Domestic Abuse Investigating Officers or Youth Involvement Officers.

GENIE

906. The statement of PC 'IP' detailed during the period covered by this report that the researching of Leicestershire Constabulary databases was made easier by the implementation of a search engine known as GENIE Classic (sometimes referred to as GENIE 1).
907. PC 'IP' explained GENIE classic was developed 'in house' and would enable searches on a number of databases to be undertaken simultaneously, including CIS and Insight, using a name, an address, a vehicle or a telephone number.

908. Between 2004 and 2007 access to GENIE Classic was given to all Police Officers and identified support staff, such as Call Management Staff, PCSOs, Intelligence Specialists and Analysts and was accessible via Leicestershire Constabulary's Intranet site.
909. Due to the volume of data a Genie search could potentially generate, it was not a tool easily utilised by call takers.
910. In the period 2004 to 2007, it appeared although officers were aware of the existence of Genie Classic, they did not use it. PC 'B' did not believe the Genie system was in place in 2004 but recognised its use now.
911. Although aware of Genie Classic, PC 'D' stated most officers used CIS as their main search tool. PC 'C' and PC 'A' also stated they would use mainly CIS and OIS.
912. CIS would only have contained the information recorded by officers in relation to crime and intelligence whereas a search on Genie Classic would have brought up the incidents reported as well.

Use of Systems and Databases by Officers

913. Both Inspector 'L' and Inspector 'J' had an expectation the PBOs should be checking the systems on a regular basis for reported incidents and crimes on their beats to enable them to be aware of the issues.
914. PS 'E' explained PBOs would brief themselves and would do this by looking through Insight and CIS; he confirmed this was something he expected the PBOs to be doing.
915. PS 'F' stated it was the responsibility of the beat team to link incidents together and they would do this by looking at the incidents, doing a Genie check and looking at crime reports.
916. PS 'G' said a very common standard working practice by PBOs when they start their duty is to review the incidents and crimes on their patch

since they were last on duty, which he stated was achievable and an expectation that as part of their daily work they would look at what was going on.

917. PC 'A' stated most of the incidents Fiona Pilkington raised he already knew about because he searched on OIS for incidents on his beat. He stated he would not look through all of the incidents because it would take too long, however occasionally he said he looked through ones that Fiona Pilkington had reported because he knew her and her family.
918. PC 'B' explained the onus would be on them, the PBOs, to use the systems to apprise themselves of incidents on the beat.
919. PC 'C' said he would not check the systems as a matter of course, not on a weekly basis. He said he would look at OIS incidents and CIS when he had time but could not look at everything and he did not have a routine of checking the systems.
920. Neither PS 'G' nor PS 'H' saw it as part of their role to undertake 'analytical work' by researching the systems to find out what was going on in their beat area.
921. Inspector 'J' and Inspector 'K' expressed their reliance on analytical support to inform them of areas of concern across the Local Policing Unit.

Finding 79

922. The systems were in place at Leicestershire Constabulary to enable officers to have searched for and linked incidents relating to the Pilkington family.

Finding 80

923. The systems in place for the recording of repeat victims was only possible when a crime was identified and a crime report generated. There was nowhere for repeat victims of 'non crime', such as anti social behaviour, to be recorded except for officers requesting history

markers or making individual entries onto the CIS intelligence database.

924. It has been established during the period July 2004 and October 2007 both Fiona Pilkington and her son were recorded as being repeat victims but despite this no coordinated approach was implemented. There is also no evidence to suggest the repeat victim notification on the crime reports for the Pilkington family offered them any enhanced level of service from Leicestershire Constabulary.
925. The difficulty in recording and researching of police systems for those persons issued with harassment warnings and the failure to implement the repeat victim procedure may also have lead to the failure in identifying a trend or pattern of behaviour towards Fiona Pilkington and her family.

Finding 81

926. It is clear from the officers' responses, supervising officers had an expectation the PBOs should have been regularly checking the systems to inform themselves of what was going on in their beat area.

Finding 82

927. Despite PC 'A' stating he would regularly check the systems, he failed to link and robustly act upon the incidents relating to the Pilkington family.

Finding 83

928. PC 'C's apparent lack of knowledge about the Pilkington family could well be explained by his failure to regularly check the incidents that occurred on his beat.

Finding 84

929. The reliance of supervising officers on the support of analysts meant the incidents reported by Fiona Pilkington were not significant enough in volume to be considered a priority.

Officers Knowledge of the Pilkington Family

930. Of all the officers interviewed, only the PBOs stated they had actually met members of the Pilkington family. It is apparent from statements other officers / PCSOs had also been to the family home.
931. PC 'A' confirmed out of all the PBOs he had the most dealings with Fiona Pilkington and her family however he wanted to make clear he did not have any sort of special relationship with her, saying he dealt with her in the same way as he did other people on his beat.
932. He said he visited 59 Bardon Road approximately five to ten times; one of these occasions was with Mr. 'HBBC3'.
933. He said Fiona Pilkington *'never ever gave me any impression that she was a manic depressive... she was always bubbly and happy'* and every time he dealt with her she was happy with what had been done.
934. Whenever he did see Fiona Pilkington, PC 'A' said she never raised anything new and it was always something somebody was dealing with.
935. PC 'A' confirmed he had met both Fiona Pilkington's son and Francecca and he knew Francecca was severely mentally disabled, stating she could walk but he thought she had a mental age of around a three to four year old.
936. He said he could not recall if Fiona Pilkington had informed him of her son's learning difficulties, but said he did not get the impression Fiona Pilkington's son had difficulties from speaking to him; although he also confirmed he had never had a full conversation with her son. He stated he had got on reasonably well with Mrs. Cassell.
937. PC 'A' stated he could not recall whether he had been aware Francecca was targeted as a result of her disability and none of the other residents of Bardon Road mentioned the Pilkington family to him that he could remember.

938. PC 'A' mentioned Fiona Pilkington had an A4 pad she used to write things down on and it was kept on a table by the living room window, but she never showed him what was in it.
939. PC 'A' was asked whether he had recognised the family as vulnerable. He said with hindsight and if he knew then what he knows now, and with the training they have had since, then maybe at the time he would have considered them a vulnerable family. He stated his perception was different now to what it was then.
940. PC 'B' stated he met the family on two occasions, when he initially visited 59 Bardon Road and when he interviewed Fiona Pilkington's son. Both related to the shed incident he dealt with in July 2004. He could not recollect any prior knowledge of the family.
941. He said Fiona Pilkington had informed him her son had learning difficulties, which he said appeared to be evident. PC 'B' explained he met Francecca briefly and she appeared to him to have significant mental health issues. He said Fiona Pilkington told him Francecca had significant issues she had to deal with at home.
942. PC 'B' described Fiona Pilkington as upset and worried for her kids, he said she was fed up and wanted some action taking. He said he certainly did not have any problems getting information from her and at no time did he doubt her mental capacity – saying she was coherent and objective. He said Fiona Pilkington was more than happy to provide a witness statement.
943. PC 'B' described Mrs. Cassell as level headed, calmer than Fiona Pilkington, but frustrated with the situation.
944. He said Fiona Pilkington herself was not vulnerable in his opinion. He was asked, given the family make up, the situation Fiona Pilkington was in and the harassment of herself and her family, whether he thought it made her vulnerable. PC 'B' said not at that stage.
945. PC 'D' stated he believed he visited 59 Bardon Road on two occasions;

once in 2004 and then again in 2007 and believes he spoke to Fiona Pilkington once on the telephone.

946. On the occasion PC 'D' visited in 2007, he described Fiona Pilkington as being fairly level headed, she appeared to him to be a fairly intelligent person and he could not see any issues with her whatsoever at the time.
947. He stated he had met Fiona Pilkington's son and, although he could not recall, he was fairly confident Fiona Pilkington had told him her son had learning difficulties. PC 'D' could not recall anything else being mentioned about Fiona Pilkington's son from other officers.
948. PC 'D' confirmed he had never met Francecca and believed his knowledge of Fiona Pilkington having a daughter who was disabled had come from his conversations with Mr. 'HBBC3' and not from Fiona Pilkington.
949. PC 'D' said he was involved in a 'patchwalk' on Bardon Road on 15 May 2007, at no time did anyone mention the Pilkington family were being directly targeted and all of the issues raised were about the 'general' anti social behaviour in the street. He stated most people were aware of the youths in family 'A' and family 'B' being the main culprits.
950. PC 'C' stated he did not believe he ever met Francecca and he was not aware of her. He also stated he was not aware of ever meeting Fiona Pilkington's son he did not know if he had ever met Mrs. Cassell.
951. He said he met whoever called in the incident on 3 July 2007 so assumed he had spoken to Fiona Pilkington on that day and this was the only time he could recollect meeting anybody from the Pilkington family. He did not think he went into 59 Bardon Road and said he did not identify any vulnerability issues there.
952. When he initially met Fiona Pilkington PC 'C' stated he believed she told him the youths in the area were a nuisance but there were no

specific issues for her at that time. He stated he was aware action was being taken in relation to the youths she mentioned and there was nothing further for him to do.

953. PC 'C' also stated nobody else had ever informed him of the Pilkington family.

Finding 85

954. It is evident from the responses given by officers who had actually met members of the Pilkington family information about the family make up was not shared between them.
955. Only PC 'A' and PC 'B' stated they had met, and were aware of Francecca's disabilities and only PC 'B' and PC 'D' stated they knew about Fiona Pilkington's son's learning difficulties.

Supervision

956. As previously outlined, the complexity of the supervision of all officers was commented on during the interviews of officers, particularly after 1 April 2007.
957. The effect of this, as well as the general supervisory set up and expectations of officers as described by those interviewed, is summarised below:

Supervision of PBOs

958. PS 'E' explained he expected the PBOs to be 'beat managers' who were responsible for their beat area. He said they were paid extra money because it was a responsible role and it was down to them to deal with any beat issues. In his role as beat Sergeant, he said he would expect PBOs to make him aware of jobs that were not straightforward or had complications.
959. PS 'G' and PS 'H' commented on similar lines stating PBOs generally would be high performing officers who could work with less supervision

and could manage the problems on their beats.

960. Inspector 'J', Inspector 'K' and Inspector 'L' all described the role of a PBO as a responsible position. They had an expectation those officers required less supervision.
961. PC 'A', PC 'C' and PC 'D' mentioned they were all given detection rate targets by their supervisors so in addition to their PBO duties they were expected to detect and tackle crime, which would mean dealing with prisoners and effectively taking them away from their beat duties. PC 'C' stated he had one of the highest arrest rates.
962. This was supported by PS 'E' who stated in his opinion sanctioned detections and reduction of crime was always the priority.
963. PC 'C' said he knew Sergeant 'E' was their Sergeant when he first started, but then at various times he was not sure where the crossovers were. He explained over the time he was a PBO, the PBOs had been supervised by a number of Sergeants who had different roles.

2004 to April 2007

964. Inspector 'J' stated his expectation of the PBO / Beat Sergeant, PS 'E', was he had day to day responsibility for the significant issues that were being flagged up in and around the neighbourhoods. He was responsible for supporting and oversight of the PBOs and had the overall line management responsibility for them.
965. Inspector 'K' explained the day to day line management of PBOs was down to the Shift Sergeant who saw them on a regular basis because the PBOs were aligned to shifts. He said the PBO / Beat Sergeant basically directed and oversaw them when it came to dealing with neighbourhood issues.

From April 2007

966. PS 'F' stated when he was a Citizen Focus Sergeant (from April 2007) he was not responsible for the PBOs' duties, or briefing them, he was

just available to give advice and offer assistance because of his involvement with the WIST meetings and other agencies.

967. In his interview PS 'E' pointed out he raised concerns over the 2007 system of line management as he was not given responsibility for officers working on his designated beat area and also regarding the expectation of Sergeants to manage a beat and run a shift.
968. PS 'H' recalled speaking to Inspector 'K' in 2007, and requesting line management responsibility for the Earl Shilton and Barwell PBOs. He said this was refused and he was told he needed to have line management responsibility for the PBOs on his own shift. PS 'H' said this caused him some problems because a different line manager was setting the Earl Shilton and Barwell PBOs' objectives for things PS 'H' said he would not have set.
969. PS 'H' said it was made quite clear to them at the start of the new system from April 2007 the Force didn't want one Sergeant to be a PBO / Beat Sergeant and one to be a Shift Sergeant (responsible for response policing). He said it was also made clear they were not meant to be PBO / Beat Sergeants either; the overriding thing was they were meant to be trying to include people from other shifts in policing their beat.
970. PS 'G' also stated he had suggested to Inspector 'XX', who was his Local Policing Unit Commander at the time and Inspector 'L' it would be better (post April 2007) for there to be five Sergeants on shift and five responsible for neighbourhood issues. He said both of them agreed with him at the time but the Senior Management Team was not prepared to change this.
971. Inspector 'L' stated he did raise this issue with senior management but was not permitted to change the Sergeants' roles. He said whilst this structure was in place, direct line management for Sergeants on a daily basis was difficult. He added the Force had only recently changed this and have reverted back to having one Sergeant on shift and separate

Neighbourhood Sergeants.

972. To combat the issue of tasking General Duties Officers on a different shift with neighbourhood tasks for the Barwell and Earl Shilton area, PS 'G' devised a Tasking Log System. He stated he would email this to the officers once a month and it would contain achievable tasks relevant to the beat priorities. He stated he would have a monthly email conference with the PBOs to identify current issues they wanted assistance with.
973. It became clear during his interview APS 'I' considered his role to be that of a 'response' Sergeant and when asked why he was given the area of Earl Shilton and Barwell as an area of responsibility, he stated his interpretation of this was because he was put on the website as a point of contact.
974. APS 'I' stated he thought it was PS 'F' who should have grasped what was going on in the Barwell area and it was not his responsibility to deal with anti social behaviour on a particular street or of a particular person because his role was 'response'.
975. He stated he was not responsible for any tasking of PC 'A' and he did not recall ever looking at PC 'A's' crime queue or anything which would be classed as directly supervising him, as his boundary was to look after the two PBOs on his shift. He continued to state he focused on the crime reports of the officers on his shift and if there was anything that was non crime recorded he would not have much information on that.
976. He confirmed he was not given more intrusive supervision even though he was an *Acting* Sergeant.

[Finding 86](#)

977. There was a general consensus across all the supervising officers the PBOs required 'minimal' supervision.
978. It is apparent the PBOs were left to manage their beats and were

expected to raise issues with supervising officers only if they were particularly difficult or if they required extra resources.

Finding 87

979. The decision to redefine the Sergeants' roles to amalgamate beat responsibilities with response policing following the change in structure from April 2007 clearly concerned several officers.
980. These concerns were brought to the attention of senior management however no changes were made to the Sergeants' roles at that time. However very recently changes have been made and there are now separate Neighbourhood Sergeants.
981. The team structure in place at the time (post April 2007) made it difficult for the supervising officers to be aware of or to have an 'active' involvement in everything that was happening in their beat area.
982. A Sergeant with the neighbourhood experience of PS 'E' would probably not have found this too difficult. However, as can be seen by APS 'I' response, there was clearly at least one supervisor who did not understand the dual responsibility.

Finding 88

983. The confusion surrounding line management of the PBOs appeared to have contributed to the lack of a cohesive approach to the problems being encountered on Bardon Road. It is evident this was a continuing issue from 2004 onwards but was compounded following the structural changes in April 2007.

Finding 89

984. The failure to adequately supervise an acting Sergeant is evident by the responses provided by APS 'I'. He seemed unaware of having any beat responsibilities and made no attempt to engage with the PBOs for the Barwell and Earl Shilton area for which he had a responsibility.

Communication

985. Poor communication is a significant feature which led to the failure of Leicestershire Constabulary to link the incidents relating to the Pilkington family.

Force Call Management Centre and Incidents

986. When assigned to deal with an incident PC 'D' stated if he was away from the station he would not go back to print an incident off prior to attending, he would rely on verbal information from the Call Management Centre. This would have been the case for all officers when on duty.
987. PC 'D' stated during his time as a PBO he would come back from a rest day and there would be several incidents left in his tray which had been closed down and printed off for ██████ (PC 'D') or 'PBO'. He said he recalled thinking at the time if those incidents were to get lost or taken off the printer with some other paperwork and mistakenly put in the bin, he would not have been aware of them and more importantly the victim would not have received an update.
988. The practice of closing and printing incidents has already been subject to comment throughout this report.
989. PS 'E' explained once an incident had been closed there was no expectation for an officer to go back and record a result on that incident. He said it would be left for the officer to generate a crime report on CIS however PS 'E' also confirmed if there was no crime to record on CIS then the result of this incident may not be recorded anywhere.
990. There was no evidence of any auditing system by supervising officers to ensure allocated incidents that had been closed had actually been actioned.

Communication between PBOs

991. PC 'A' and PC 'B' said at the time PC 'B' was a PBO, they did not see much of each other due to being on opposite shifts. PC 'A' could not say if there were any systems in place to notify each other of incidents they had dealt with and although they did speak occasionally, PC 'B' explained the onus would be on them to use the systems to apprise themselves of incidents on the beat.
992. During discussions with PC 'B' about his liaison with the council he said he would not discuss his meetings with the council with the rest of the beat team (PC 'A' and PS 'E') as it was not that big an issue at the time. It should be pointed out this was prior to the set up of WIST. He said they would approach the council on an individual basis and although they were the Barwell 'team', they were very much individual.
993. PC 'D' stated when he had dealt with incidents involving the Pilkington family he did discuss those with the Barwell officers, however he could not recall actual conversations.
994. PC 'D' also considered the 'beat team' communicated with each other quite well, considering they were all on different shift patterns. He said all four of the Earl Shilton and Barwell PBOs would verbally communicate.
995. He said he could remember sending emails about matters but they would normally have a cross over period and time to discuss any issues. He also said they did have a couple of beat team meetings where they would raise relevant issues.
996. PC 'C' stated there was no formal system in place to pass information on to the rest of the beat team other than word of mouth. He said if there was something he thought was relevant he would pass it on but also said he did not know what would be relevant from one person to another.
997. In relation to his 'introductory' visit to Bardon Road on 3 July 2007, PC

'C' stated he saw no reason to record any of the information he received from the residents or pass this on to the rest of the beat team as it was 'nothing new'. He stated he already knew about the youths causing problems and they were already being dealt with.

998. PS 'E' also said there were no systems in place for the PBOs to update each other in 2004 and said one of the things he tried to do at the time was have beat meetings. He said this was extremely difficult because of the shift patterns and in six months he would be lucky to have two meetings for any beat. He said the PBOs dealt with their individual incidents and nothing was ever linked in properly.
999. He stated in 2007 communication between PBOs was pretty much the same as in 2004, but by then there were also PCSOs. He said the PCSOs worked separate shift patterns to the PBOs so if anything communication was worse because of this separate tier of policing, and PS 'E' still covering all the beats.
1000. PS 'G' stated, as a manager, he expected the PBOs would communicate with each other. He said they had access to email, phones, they all worked in the same building and they had the flexibility to change duties.
1001. Neither Inspector 'J' or Inspector 'K' considered communication was a problem between the PBOs. Both stated there were systems in place to enable them to communicate with each other, mentioning emails and voicemail.
1002. Inspector 'J' also stated the PBOs would at times work together on operations and there were opportunities for engagement. He said he found it difficult for them to say they were oblivious to what the other PBO on their beat was doing.
1003. Inspector 'K' added the PBOs, although on shifts, had a degree of flexibility in their duties and they did speak to each other.
1004. By 2007 Inspector 'L' stated communication was not ideal as officers

were constrained by shift patterns and the supervision imposed by the force.

1005. Inspector 'L' said he arranged a PBO / PCSO day and believed this initially took place in August 2007. This was something that was relatively new and he said he tried to do these every six months.

1006. He stated this was a big decision to take a large number of resources away from the neighbourhoods, which had a knock on affect on the Local Policing Unit.

Management Communication

1007. The PBOs all said they did not have specific briefings as such. If they were around they occasionally attended the shift briefing but explained this was more geared to the General Duties Officers and not to PBOs and beat issues.

1008. PS 'E' stated the difference in shift patterns meant PBOs had to self brief. He said this was the case in 2004 and also on his return to the role in 2006.

1009. The information contained in the letters written by Fiona Pilkington in 2004 and 2007 appeared to have failed to reach all of those officers responsible for policing the Barwell beat.

1010. Inspector 'K' could not say whether he had seen the letter Fiona Pilkington wrote in 2007, neither could PS 'E'.

1011. The 'monitoring' of the situation by PC 'A' was clearly not overseen by his supervisors and the general consensus was, once PC 'A' had emailed he had seen Fiona Pilkington, the matter was deemed to have been dealt with.

Finding 90

1012. As previously mentioned, the practice of closing incidents without a result and the printing of incidents for a specific officer by the Call Management Centre was deeply flawed.

Finding 91

1013. There are conflicting views between officers across ranks regarding the PBOs' ability to communicate with each other and the frequency of this communication.
1014. It seems apparent any communication difficulties experienced by the PBOs were not brought to the attention of their supervisors, and either the supervisors did not recognise there was a problem or did little to rectify it.
1015. However, as the PBOs were considered 'beat managers' perhaps they should have devised a system themselves to improve their communication.

Finding 92

1016. Although it is appreciated PBOs on the same beat were unlikely to work together often because of the need for a shift system and there was perhaps no 'formal' updating system in place, there were plenty of other methods open to the PBOs to communicate with each other.
1017. As evidenced by the email to Inspector 'J', the Force did have this facility in April 2004.

Misconduct Considerations

1018. What follows is a summary of the investigation findings relevant to the allegations made to each officer as detailed in their individual Regulation 14A Notice.

PC 'A'

Log 872 11 June 2004

1019. PC 'A' did respond to this incident however the investigation found no evidence to show he spoke to the offending youths or that any action was taken to deal with their behaviour.
1020. It could not be established whether PC 'A' did, or did not speak to PS

'E' about 'Anti Social Behaviour Orders' as stated on the incident log or about the incident at all.

Log 800 22 June 2004

1021. Although stating he knew of this incident, PC 'A' could not state whether he knew about it at the time. He was on rest days from 22 to 25 June 2004 but as he stated he would check incidents on his beat, it is reasonable to believe PC 'A' could have made himself aware of this information on his return to duty, but this could not be proven either way.

Log 896 25 June 2004

1022. PC 'A' responded to this incident on 28 June 2004 and by this time it was clear he was aware of at least two, more probably three, incidents reported over a 14 day period.

1023. This knowledge did not seem to help him notice or identify the levels of the anti social behaviour displayed towards Fiona Pilkington and her family.

Letter 5 February 2007

1024. PC 'A' did not appear to undertake any research which may have linked this letter to PC 'B's investigation in 2004 and the more recent events in early February 2007.

1025. By the time PC 'A' had responded by email stating he had visited Fiona Pilkington, five incidents had been reported; including the report of youths shouting abuse at Francecca.

1026. He was aware Fiona Pilkington kept notes but he did not take witness statements from either Fiona Pilkington or Mrs. Cassell which may have assisted in any subsequent proceedings.

1027. PC 'A' failed to conduct a thorough investigation or recognise the distress in Fiona Pilkington's letter. This meant an opportunity was lost to collate information and assist the family.

1028. PC 'A' stated he would 'monitor the situation' yet he failed to do so, again he lost the opportunity to collate information which could have contributed to more robust action.

[Log 693 13 February 2007 \(and linked incident\)](#)

1029. It is incomprehensible PC 'A' would appear to have been informed of these incidents by two different Sergeants and yet still seemed not to have known about them. However, the investigation could not evidence whether or not PC 'A' did respond to these incidents.

[Log 929 6 April 2007](#)

1030. Although PC 'A' stated he could not really recall this incident, this was reported only a few days after he sent the 'monitoring' email and as he did visit Fiona Pilkington regarding this incident a few days after PC 'D' responded, he was clearly aware of it at the time.

1031. There also appeared to be some communication between PC 'D' and PC 'A' about reallocation of the crime report, which would also indicate he had an awareness of this incident.

[Log 1240 2 June 2007](#)

1032. PC 'D' responded initially to this incident.

1033. PC 'A' was on leave from 27 May 2007 to 12 June 2007 and believed he did go round to see Fiona Pilkington upon his return in relation to this incident, however he could not recall liaising with PC 'D' over this matter. The investigation could not find evidence to suggest this took place either way.

[WIST Meetings](#)

1034. At WIST meetings, PC 'A' did not feel the need to mention the issues reported by Fiona Pilkington as 'he did not feel she had experienced anything more than anyone else in Barwell or Earl Shilton and it was not something that had been identified as a major problem'.

1035. This statement made by PC 'A' is alarming. As a PBO it is safe to

assume PC 'A' should have a good knowledge and understanding of what was happening within the streets he had responsibility for.

1036. It may be this particular statement boils down to an individual's perception of the area, but as is clearly highlighted within this investigation Fiona Pilkington and her family were experiencing a considerable amount of anti social behaviour and / or harassment, which certainly would have been relevant to have been discussed at the WIST meetings.

Anti Social Behaviour Policy

1037. Despite PC 'A' being aware of Warning Letters and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts being issued to youths in relation to Bardon Road, he did not take it upon himself to record this information on the CIS intelligence data base, therefore losing the opportunity to gather and share vital information.

Systems and Databases

1038. Although PC 'A' claimed to check the systems on a regular basis, he seemed content to allow other officers to deal with incidents involving the Pilkington family in isolation and did not proactively link or coordinate any police response to assist the family.

Knowledge of the Pilkington family

1039. PC 'A' was a PBO for the Barwell area from 2004. By his own admission, of the PBOs, he had the most contact with the Pilkington family.

1040. He knew of Francecca's disabilities and the letter written by Fiona Pilkington in 2007 detailed her distress at the ongoing issues with local youths.

1041. PC 'A' was in possession of sufficient information to have recognised the Pilkingtons were a vulnerable family however he did not act upon or share this information with colleagues or other agencies.

1042. Despite this, PC 'A' could in no way have foreseen the action taken by

Fiona Pilkington.

Communication

1043. Although it is appreciated the PBOs on the same beat were unlikely to work together often because of the need for a shift system, and there was perhaps no 'formal' updating system in place, there were plenty of other methods open to the PBOs to communicate with each other.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1044. Based on the evidence outlined in this report, the investigation concludes PC 'A' did not take sufficient effective action to deal with a number of incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington and therefore PC 'A' does have a case to answer for Misconduct.

PC 'B'

Log 932 3 July 2004 and letters of complaint

1045. The investigation has been unable to establish the point at which PC 'B' was tasked to deal with the letters of complaint written by Fiona Pilkington.

1046. The poor communication between PC 'B' and PC 'A' meant PC 'A' appeared to be unaware of the action taken by PC 'B' at this time.

1047. The level of communication between PS 'E' and PC 'B' regarding Fiona Pilkington's letters and the incident of 3 July 2004 could not be established.

1048. PC 'B' had printed several incidents and also taken a witness statement from Fiona Pilkington which named the youths involved in the harassment. This was in addition to the incident with Fiona Pilkington's son on 3 July 2004.

1049. PC 'B' said he was acting in accordance with Fiona Pilkington's wishes however he also appeared to have made his own mind up about how he was going to deal with matters as he stated *'he saw it as an 11 year old kid with learning difficulties playing silly devils and trying to frighten*

somebody'.

1050. Although the perpetrator was 'an 11 year old kid', the age of criminal responsibility is, and was then, 10 years old. PC 'B's failure to adequately investigate the incident also left the parent of the perpetrator disbelieving her son's actions and thus unlikely to address his behaviour.
1051. It is found PC 'B' more likely than not did make contact with the council regarding the incident. His contact with Fiona Pilkington's son's school is documented in the school records.
1052. The investigation recognised of all the officers who dealt with the Pilkington family, PC 'B' was the only officer who actually conducted any type of investigation into the incidents reported which related to the Pilkington family.
1053. He was the only officer who obtained a witness statement from Fiona Pilkington detailing the historic incidents of harassment the family had suffered – which included incidents not before reported to police. This statement was held within the CIS crime system and available to other officers.
1054. Even with the benefit of hindsight, PC 'B' insisted he would take the same action again which the investigation finds concerning.

Knowledge of the Pilkington Family

1055. Despite his knowledge of the family, PC 'B' did not deem it relevant to share information about the family with his colleagues. He assumed other officers would find his crime report and Fiona Pilkington's statement via a search in CIS.

Communication

1056. Although it is appreciated PBOs on the same beat were unlikely to work together often because of the need for a shift system and there was perhaps no 'formal' updating system in place, there were plenty of other methods open to the PBOs to communicate with each other.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1057. Based on the evidence outlined in this report, the investigation concludes PC 'B' did not take sufficient action to effectively deal with the seriousness of the incident as reported to him by Fiona Pilkington's son during his interview in July 2004.

1058. Therefore PC 'B' does have a case to answer for Misconduct.

1059. However, the investigation also concludes PC 'B' did attempt to assist Fiona Pilkington and her family to deal with reported anti social behaviour incidents.

PC 'C'

Log 699 28 October 2005

1060. At the time the incident was printed PC 'C' was not on duty however that did not necessarily mean he did not receive it.

1061. PC 'C' stated he could not recollect responding to the incident and as the incident had been closed without any update, the investigation could not establish how or if this incident was resolved by Leicestershire Constabulary.

Log 756 3 November 2005 (and linked incident)

1062. PC 'C' had no recollection or note of this incident despite again appearing to have been given a print out of both incidents as reported on 3 November 2005 and also the one on 28 October 2005.

1063. Based on the account given by PCSO 'PP', it is feasible she did discuss anti social behaviour letters with a PBO however the investigation could not ascertain if this was PC 'C'.

Log 812 3 July 2007

1064. PC 'C' did respond to this incident, however despite being a PBO for the Barwell area PC 'C' stated this was his first recollection of dealing with Fiona Pilkington.

1065. It appeared he had some prior knowledge of anti social behaviour on the Bardon Road, hence the reason for him being on Bardon Road that day, however it is concerning PC 'C' appeared to have no background knowledge of the Pilkington family's reported incidents at the time.

Parish Council Meeting

1066. PC 'C' 's attendance at a Barwell Parish Council meeting in September 2007, although he could not recall the details, showed an awareness he must have had at the time of a level of anti social behaviour in the vicinity of Bardon and Bradgate Road, Barwell.

1067. The statement of PC 'C' dated 29 October 2007 was further evidence of PC 'C's knowledge of anti social behaviour on Bardon Road.

Anti Social Behaviour Policy

1068. Despite PC 'C' being aware of Warning Letters and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts being issued to youths in relation to Bardon Road, he did not take it upon himself to record this information on the CIS intelligence data base, therefore losing the opportunity to gather and share vital information.

Systems / Databases

1069. There was an expectation from supervising officers the PBOs should have checked the incidents on their beat on a regular basis. PC 'C' stated he did not do this.

1070. PC 'C' did not regularly check the incidents on his beat. Had he done so, he may well have been more aware of the incidents relating to the Pilkington family.

1071. PC 'C' was a PBO for the Barwell area for a significant amount of time and as such, the investigation has found he did have knowledge of anti social behaviour on Bardon Road.

Communication

1072. Although it is appreciated PBOs on the same beat were unlikely to work

together often because of the need for a shift system and there was perhaps no 'formal' updating system in place, there were plenty of other methods open to the PBOs to communicate with each other.

1073. Although it is commendable for a police officer to have a high detection rate, this appeared to have taken him away from his duties as a PBO to deal with neighbourhood issues – such as those important to the Pilkington family.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1074. The investigation could not evidence sufficient contact between PC 'C' and the Pilkington family to substantiate the allegation he did not take sufficient effective action to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington and therefore PC 'C' does not have a case to answer for Misconduct.

1075. The investigation therefore recommends PC 'C' be considered for Unsatisfactory Performance Procedures (UPP).

PC 'D'

Log 810 28 July 2004

1076. PC 'D' did respond to this incident and although the action taken by him has been deemed inappropriate, the investigation recognises PC 'D' was still a probationer at the time of this incident and a General Duties Officer, not yet a PBO.

Log 885 1 February 2007

1077. PC 'D' could not recall this incident and due to the premature closure of the incident, the investigation has been unable to establish if any officer actually did respond.

Log 929 6 April 2007

1078. PC 'D' did respond to this incident and explained his rationale in how it was dealt with.

1079. He provided a diary entry that suggested he did make contact with the council following this incident, despite his failure to submit a statement, however this was not until 26 April, 20 days after the reported incident.

Diary / notes 10 May 2007

1080. The investigation could not establish if Fiona Pilkington did leave a voicemail message for PC 'D'.

Log 1240 2 June 2007

1081. PC 'D' did respond to this incident but stated Fiona Pilkington could not say for definite who the youths were as it had been too dark.

1082. Through another diary entry provided by PC 'D' it is accepted, in all probability, PC 'D' did speak to Mr. 'HBBC3' at the council.

WIST Meetings

1083. Despite PC 'D' stating he had raised the Pilkington family during one meeting and he had spoken to Mr. 'HBBC3' prior to that meeting, Mr. 'HBBC3' confirmed in his statement neither Fiona Pilkington nor her family were discussed at any WIST meetings and none of the officers interviewed could recall her being mentioned.

1084. The issues faced by the Pilkington family were not formally raised during WIST meetings however, even though other officers and Mr. 'HBBC3' could not recall the Pilkington family being mentioned, the investigation could not confirm or refute PC 'D's claim he did raise the family during one meeting.

Knowledge of the Pilkington Family

1085. Based on PC 'D's contact with the Pilkington family and given the lack of communication between the Barwell PBOs, it is deemed unlikely PC 'A' would have shared his more thorough knowledge of the family with PC 'D' – PC 'D' having only met Fiona Pilkington and her son.

1086. Although by the time PC 'D' was a PBO it appeared Barwell and Earl Shilton was classed as one beat, it was common working practice PC

'D' was a PBO for Earl Shilton and as such, would not have been expected to have had the in depth knowledge of Barwell as PC 'A' or PC 'C' should have done.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1087. Although the investigation has evidenced contact between PC 'D' and the Pilkington family, considering his role and the actions he took, the allegation that he did not take sufficient effective action to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington is unsubstantiated.

1088. Therefore it is decided PC 'D' has no case to answer for Misconduct.

PS 'E'

Letter 26 April 2004

1089. Although PS 'E' could not recall any involvement with this letter, the fact it is recorded he issued some kind of response indicates he did know of the letter at the time.

Log 872 11 June 2004

1090. The investigation could not establish whether there was any communication between PS 'E' and PC 'A' regarding anti social behaviour action or even this incident.

1091. PS 'E' could not recall whether PC 'A' had spoken to him or not.

Log 932 3 July 2004 and letters of complaint

1092. Again, although PS 'E' could not recall this incident the entry in PC 'B's' pocket notebook demonstrated there was some communication between him and PC 'B' about Fiona Pilkington's complaint at the time.

1093. It would appear by this entry PS 'E' was in some way tasking PC 'B' to undertake an investigation and therefore knew of Fiona Pilkington's complaint and the incident involving Fiona Pilkington's son.

1094. The investigation was unable to establish whether PC 'B' informed PS 'E' of his actions following the investigation or if he did, what was

communicated.

Letter 5 February 2007

1095. PS 'E' could not recall this letter and the investigation could find no evidence to suggest he did know about it at the time.

WIST

1096. PS 'E' chaired the WIST meeting on a regular basis; even showing on the minutes in July 2007. As a Sergeant he failed to ensure the police had any kind of recording system in place regarding the issuing of anti social behaviour action against the youths.

1097. As the chair of WIST he also failed to encourage a more robust approach in relation to the youths of family 'A' following their refusal to engage and sign the Acceptable Behaviour Contracts.

Systems / Databases

1098. As a supervisor, PS 'E' should have ensured the PBOs were conducting regular checks of the systems.

Supervision

1099. There was a general consensus across all the supervising officers the PBOs required 'minimal' supervision.

1100. It is apparent the PBOs were left to manage their beats and were expected to raise issues with supervising officers only if they were particularly difficult or if they required extra resources.

1101. PS 'E' should have been more intrusive as a supervisor. He should have been actively finding out the issues on the beats rather than waiting for the PBOs to feed him the information.

Communication

1102. Although PS 'E' tried to have beat team meetings, he recognised at the time this was difficult. He said himself the PBOs dealt with their individual incidents and nothing was ever linked in properly, however

as their supervisor, he did not address this issue at the time.

1103. He recognised communication between the PBOs was not ideal but appeared to do little to rectify this.

1104. The level of supervision given by PS 'E' is seen as inadequate alongside his poor knowledge of the work being carried out by PBOs.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1105. Based on the evidence outlined in this report, the investigation concludes PS 'E' did not ensure sufficient effective action was taken to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington. Therefore PS 'E' does have a case to answer for Misconduct.

PS 'F'

Log 693 13 February 2007 (and linked incident)

1106. PS 'F' closed the linked incident without obtaining a positive result as he felt it was being dealt with by PC 'A' in the long term. He also failed to print off the incident relating to the report by Fiona Pilkington.

1107. However, at this time PS 'F' did not have responsibility for neighbourhood issues or the PBOs.

Log 929 6 April 2007

1108. The investigation established incidents on the 'Hinckley Sergeants' Queue' were allocated to officers by a variety of Hinckley Sergeants on a daily basis.

1109. Despite allocating this incident to PC 'D', PS 'F' could not recall it and the investigation could not find any further evidence of PS 'F' involvement outside the initial allocation.

WIST

1110. In all probability PS 'F' took over chairing the WIST meetings some time in July 2007. As it has already been established, the Pilkington family were unlikely to have been mentioned during these meetings.

1111. However, family 'A' were still not engaging with the Acceptable Behaviour Contract process and there is no evidence to suggest this was proactively challenge by the police. As chair of WIST and responsible for neighbourhood policing, PS 'F' should have raised this as an issue.

Supervision

1112. From April 2007 PS 'F' did have supervisory responsibility for neighbourhood policing, but not the line management of the PBOs or their duties. He expected the PBOs to bring any neighbourhood problems to him as he was there to offer advice.
1113. PS 'F' stated it was the responsibility of the beat team to link incidents together.
1114. The division of neighbourhood responsibility between PS 'F' and PS 'E' was not clear. PS 'F' claimed to have responsibility from April 2007 as part of his Citizen Focus role however, PS 'E' was still chairing the WIST meetings until at least 10 July 2007.
1115. From April 2007 the responsibility for neighbourhood policing, beat areas and PBOs was confusing and appeared to be spread over several Sergeants.
1116. The responsibility for neighbourhood policing was not PS 'F's only role and although that carried a degree of responsibility for tackling anti social behaviour, it appears he was not expected to supervise the PBOs.
1117. Leicestershire Constabulary did not create a clear supervisory role which effectively had oversight of neighbourhood policing to enable anti social behaviour to be robustly tackled.
1118. The investigation has been unable to establish for certain the point Barwell and Earl Shilton became a 'priority beat' and thus when PS 'F' became the responsible Sergeant, however PS 'G' stated he took over as Citizen Focus Sergeant in December 2007 so in all probability it was

not until after the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francessca Hardwick.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1119. Considering his role and his level of knowledge of the Pilkington family, the allegation PS 'F' did not take sufficient effective action to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington is unsubstantiated.

1120. Therefore the investigation concludes PS 'F' has no case to answer for Misconduct.

PS 'G'

Log 867 25 September 2007 and crime report SH/03939/07

1121. The action taken by PCSO 'UU' was seen as adequate regarding the report of the broken window, and the decision by PS 'G' to sign off the report is understandable given his knowledge of the area and the lack of evidence. However, there is no evidence to suggest the anti social behaviour issues Fiona Pilkington was also reporting had been addressed.

Crime Report SH/04050/07-0

1122. This report did not relate to the Pilkington family but did mention the youths involved who were also responsible for harassing the Pilkington family. This was included in the Regulation 14A Notice of PS 'G' but has not formed part of the report.

1123. PS 'G' explained during interview his involvement in this incident came after the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francessca Hardwick.

Supervision

1124. The decision to redefine the Sergeants' roles to amalgamate beat responsibilities with response policing following the change in structure from April 2007 concerned several officers, including PS 'G'.

1125. He raised his concerns with his supervisors however no changes to this system were made until only very recently.

1126. The team structure in place at the time (post April 2007) made it difficult for the supervising officers to be aware of or to have an 'active' involvement in everything that was happening in their beat area.

1127. It was clear PS 'G' did make an effort to combat anti social behaviour issues on the Barwell beat as evidenced by the Tasking Log System.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1128. Considering his role and his level of knowledge of the Pilkington family, the allegation PS 'G' did not take sufficient effective action to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington is unsubstantiated.

1129. Therefore the investigation concludes PS 'G' has no case to answer for Misconduct.

PS 'H'

Supervision

1130. PS 'H' requested to have line management responsibility for the Earl Shilton and Barwell PBO's but this was refused.

1131. The system of supervision at the time put constraints on Neighbourhood Team Leaders, such as PS 'H', in relation to their beat areas and management of the PBOs.

1132. PS 'H' was only responsible for the Barwell area for less than two months and the investigation could find no evidence PS 'H' dealt with any incidents involving the Pilkington family.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1133. Considering his role and his level of knowledge of the Pilkington family, the allegation PS 'H' did not take sufficient effective action to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington is unsubstantiated.

1134. Therefore the investigation concludes PS 'H' has no case to answer for Misconduct.

APS 'I'

Supervision

1135. APS 'I' clearly did not have a full grasp of the Neighbourhood Team Leader role. As an acting Sergeant he should have received more intrusive supervision and guidance.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1136. Considering his role and his level of knowledge of the Pilkington family, the allegation APS 'I' did not take sufficient effective action to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington is unsubstantiated.
1137. Therefore the investigation concludes APS 'I' has no case to answer for Misconduct.
1138. However, if APS 'I' was still a serving officer with Leicestershire Constabulary the investigation would recommend the instigation of Unsatisfactory Performance Procedures (UPP), but due to the passage of time and the fact he is now a serving PC in another Force this is not deemed feasible.

Inspector 'J'

Log 932 3 July 2004 and letters of complaint

1139. The investigation has been unable to establish at what point Inspector 'J' tasked PC 'B' to investigate the complaints made by Fiona Pilkington. What is clear is that no action was taken in relation to either of Fiona Pilkington's letters until after the incident on 3 July.
1140. The letter from Fiona Pilkington of 15 June 2004 should have received much more robust attention from Inspector 'J' prior to the incident of 3 July 2004. He should have ensured a higher level of supervision from either himself or PS 'E' was in place.
1141. The failure in communication between Inspector 'J', PS 'E' and PC 'B' appeared to contribute to the continuing failure to collate all the

incidents at an earlier stage.

1142. It should be noted Inspector 'J' had two letters from Fiona Pilkington. The letter of 15 June 2004 clearly showed her family were not only suffering from prolonged anti social behaviour but her daughter was disabled and her son suffered constant bullying.
1143. However, Inspector 'J' could only base his decision that an effective investigation had taken place by viewing the documents put before him by PC 'B', which did not include accurate details of the threats made to Fiona Pilkington's son.
1144. Despite the criticisms of Inspector 'J's handling of the complaints by Fiona Pilkington in 2004, reported incidents relating to the Pilkington family *did* reduce for the remainder of Inspector 'J's tenure as the Local Policing Commander.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1145. Considering the report submitted by PC 'B' did not reflect the true nature of events and the actions taken by Inspector 'J', the allegation that he did not take sufficient effective action to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington is unsubstantiated.
1146. Therefore the investigation concludes Inspector 'J' has no case to answer for Misconduct.

Inspector 'K'

Letter 05 February 2007

1147. As the Local Policing Unit Commander it is not acceptable Inspector 'K' did not make himself aware of this letter. In interview he stated it would only have been emailed to him, 'because he was the LPU Commander' – which is exactly why he *should* have made himself aware of it.
1148. Inspector 'K' should have ensured a cohesive approach to deal with the issues raised in the letters and the related incidents but he failed to do so.

1149. During his tenure there were 11 calls/incidents regarding Fiona Pilkington and her family which he knew nothing about.
1150. This is different to 2004 in that incidents relating to the Pilkington family continued to be reported to Leicestershire stating problems were 'ongoing'.
1151. Inspector 'K' expected to be informed of any issues from staff below him in the chain of command but he gave no evidence of any structure of a more searching and intrusive method of supervision to ensure this was in fact taking place.
1152. It is also clear APS 'I' did not have an adequate knowledge of what his role was during his time at Hinckley which again indicates Inspector 'K' did not display an intrusive level of supervision / management of his staff.

Conclusion on Misconduct Allegations

1153. Based on the evidence outlined in this report, the investigation concludes Inspector 'K' did not ensure sufficient effective action was taken to deal with the incidents and assist Fiona Pilkington.
1154. Therefore the investigation concludes Inspector 'K' does have a case to answer for Misconduct.

Inspector 'L'

1155. The Regulation 14a Notice for Inspector 'L' was withdrawn on 29 October 2010.

Changes made by Leicestershire Constabulary

1156. It is clear Leicestershire Constabulary have learnt many lessons from the tragic deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick and have made some significant changes to the way they monitor anti social behaviour and how they view vulnerable persons as follows:

Systems and Databases

GENIE 2

1157. PC 'IP' detailed in his statement GENIE 2 replaced GENIE Classic and went live in December 2008.
1158. He explained GENIE 2 takes advantage of new technology to improve performance, search more systems and now also has the ability to link directly to other systems (such as CIS).
1159. Inspector 'IUM' stated that recently Call Management Centre staff had been conducting GENIE 2 checks in order to alert the assigned officer that information is on there which might be relevant to the incident they are attending. They endorse the log for the officer to check GENIE 2 but do not 'sift' through the information themselves.
1160. Leicestershire Constabulary have clearly utilised the functions of GENIE 2 to assist in identifying vulnerable people – please refer to the section 'Identifying Vulnerability' below.

CIS

1161. Inspector 'YY' described how as a short term measure, Leicestershire Constabulary had been using CIS as a case management system to record anti social behaviour incidents using a specific code for identification.
1162. Vulnerable people are also being identified on CIS using code 33333.
1163. Since 2008 Inspector 'YY' explained the Force recorded 'non-crime'

incidents involving 'vulnerable adults' on CIS ,as prior to 2008 these incidents would have only been recorded if they amounted to a criminal offence.

Command and Control

1164. At the time of Inspector 'YY''s report, Leicestershire Constabulary were expecting the imminent introduction of a new Command and Control, system to replace OIS.

1165. The effect of this new system on the recording of incidents and the Force's ability to link related incidents has yet to be established.

IR3

1166. The statement of Assistant Chief Constable 'ZZ' (dated 27 May 2009) described an IT system that had been piloted by Leicestershire Constabulary's North Borough Command Unit called IR3.

1167. He explained the system displays crimes and incidents on a map view over a specified period of time, enabling officers to identify hot spots where there had been more than one incident.

1168. He stated in the case of Fiona Pilkington, IR3 properly used, should have highlighted all of the incidents in the locality of Bardon Road, Barwell.

Identifying Vulnerability

1169. Assistant Chief Constable 'ZZ' confirmed in his statement all operational police officers were to be given training in identifying vulnerability in all its forms. Officers interviewed stated they had since received a one day Power Point input on vulnerability.

1170. Assistant Chief Constable 'ZZ' also referred to the introduction of a 'Golden Nominal' flag for vulnerable persons to be incorporated into GENIE 2.

1171. He explained the practical effect of this would be if the police responded to an incident involving a vulnerable person, the officer

would, by entering a name or other information into GENIE 2, be able to immediately identify the person as vulnerable and ensure they receive an appropriate level of service based on their vulnerability and past events.

1172. As part of Leicestershire Constabulary's responsibilities towards managing information, PC 'IP' explained a pilot team (the MoPI RRD Team) was currently in place within the Force to identify and flag vulnerable adults on GENIE 2 based on information known to Leicestershire Constabulary.
1173. PC 'IP' stated this work was being carried out in conjunction with the Force's Adult Referral Co-ordination Team who request reviews of any adults who they deem to have a higher risk of vulnerability. He said information flows both ways between the teams as, should the MoPI RRD Team identify possible vulnerable adults, then these would be flagged to the Adult Referral Co-ordination Team for assessment.
1174. In her report to the Chief Constable dated 12 August 2010, Inspector 'YY' stated the Adult Referral and Co-ordination Team was established by Leicestershire Constabulary in April 2010 and its remit was to provide a cohesive and comprehensive police approach to safeguarding adults at risk of harm.
1175. Assistant Chief Constable 'ZZ' confirmed in his statement Leicestershire Constabulary would be using the definition of a 'vulnerable person' as defined in the 'No Secrets' policy:
- 'Is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and
Is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation.'*
1176. The investigation is concerned this definition would still not have been sufficient to identify Fiona Pilkington as a vulnerable person based on her circumstances.

Call Management Centre

1177. Inspector 'CMC2', based in Leicestershire Constabulary's Call Management Centre, explained they had introduced a call handling aide memoire which directed the call handler to consider the vulnerability of the caller/victim at the initial point of telephone contact – thus having an impact on police response.
1178. In relation to anti social behaviour, Inspector 'CMC2' said there were now also procedures in place to assist the call handler in establishing further information from the caller such as asking if this was an ongoing problem.
1179. Inspector 'IUM' stated at present, staff within the Call Management Centre were the only people who could close incidents. Call takers can still only close incidents they had telephone resolved (Grade 4) with the exception of those relating to anti social behaviour as of 17 May 2010. These incidents are sent through to Local Policing Unit queues to establish whether an assessment should be made as to whether an anti social behaviour record should be created on CIS.
1180. The incident log should be updated with a 'result' or 'action taken' before closure and in this respect Inspector 'IUM' stated Force procedure to close an incident has always been the same, however this is not always practiced.
1181. Inspector 'IUM' described the current 'diary' system now implemented by the Force to combat the problem of incidents being left open, sometimes for weeks, due to no officers being available. This was a factor in some of the incidents reported relating to the Pilkington family.
1182. Since February 2008, for non emergency type incidents, callers are now offered appointments for an officer to visit to suit the caller; ideally within 48 hours.
1183. Inspector 'IUM' explained the system is monitored by the Crime and Incident Unit and as such, unresolved incidents are no longer left open

for long periods of time. If an appointment is missed, a reason has to be documented by the officer and a further appointment arranged. PBOs and PCSOs are included in the diary system.

Mobile Data Terminals

1184. Mobile Data Terminals were introduced in police vehicles by Leicestershire Constabulary in June 2008.
1185. The terminals enable officers to access Force systems remotely, such as the Command and Control System to view incidents and GENIE 2, and thus allows officers access to information prior to, or whilst, attending an incident.

Multi Agency Working

Joint Action Quality of Life

1186. The Joint Action Quality of Life Team was set up in July 2008 by PS 'G' and has co-located members of the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Community Safety Team working at Hinckley Police Station.
1187. The team uses data provided by anti social behaviour analysts and other intelligence to highlight hot spot locations.
1188. Although information sharing between the council and police has improved, it has been reported the incompatibility of the police and council IT systems is a hindrance.
1189. The WIST meetings continue to run on a weekly basis.

Sentinal

1190. Although Leicestershire Constabulary have utilised CIS to record vulnerable persons and non crime anti social behaviour, Inspector 'YY' explained the disadvantage with this system (CIS) is it is not directly accessed by partner agencies.
1191. She stated the long-term solution to this being proposed in early 2011 was the introduction of the Sentinal system.

1192. In his statement Assistant Chief Constable 'ZZ' described a Sentinel pilot project which took place between Charnwood Local Policing Unit (North Leicestershire) and Charnwood Borough Council.
1193. He explained Sentinel was a computer based system, jointly owned and accessible by the police and the council, which recorded low level anti social behaviour incidents with the potential for sharing that data with local authorities.

Inter-agency Community Safety Bureau (ICSB)

1194. Inspector 'YY' explained an Inter-agency Community Safety Bureau (ICSB) was established by early 2008 which took call data from the police and local authorities and identified patterns and hotspots of anti social behaviour. She explained this also allowed repeat callers to be identified and an assessment of vulnerability to be made.
1195. Inspector 'YY' also stated work continues around opportunities to share bulk data between agencies as this would allow for early identification of patterns where the data is spread across a number of agencies and would therefore not be identified by hotspot analysis.

Leicestershire Constabulary Policies

1196. Assistant Chief Constable 'ZZ' explained in his statement the 2007 Anti Social Behaviour Incremental Approach Policy was reviewed in March 2008 and an updated policy known as the 'ASB Policy' was implemented on 1 April 2008. He stated a number of presentations were given to frontline staff to introduce the new policy.
1197. Largely unchanged from the 2007 policy, the updated version included a section on 'Parenting Contracts and Parenting Orders'. Parenting Contracts are similar to the Acceptable Behaviour Contracts and are voluntary agreements made by the parents of the youths causing trouble.
1198. The Force Hate Crime Policy has been referred to earlier in this report.

Supervision

1199. Both PS 'F' and PS 'G' confirmed that recently (February 2010) Hinckley had changed the organization of the Sergeants to incorporate shift and beat Sergeants – the system PS 'G' said he had suggested in 2007.
1200. Assistant Chief Constable 'ZZ' in his statement described changes had been made to Leicestershire Constabulary's South Borough Command Unit (which includes Hinckley) in relation to information provided to the Senior Management Team regarding repeat victims, vulnerable persons, Hate Crime and anti social behaviour.
1201. In interview Inspector 'J' stated during the daily update meeting now (the 'ring round'), the first question they go to is 'what are the issues around vulnerability' and what they will do about it.

Recommendations

1202. Ordinarily a separate Learning Report would be completed in addition to this report however, due to the changes already made by Leicestershire Constabulary since the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick, any further recommendations will be made here.

Recommendation 1

1203. Incidents need to record a result before they are closed in order for Leicestershire Constabulary to ensure each reported incident has been dealt with appropriately.

Recommendation 2

1204. Information sharing between PBOs regarding issues and people within their beat area needs to improve.

Recommendation 3

1205. Leicestershire Constabulary's definition of a vulnerable person needs to reflect a person's circumstances as well as them as an individual.

Failure to do this could result in persons in a similar situation to Fiona Pilkington being considered in isolation and not treated as vulnerable.

Recommendation 4

1206. Leicestershire Constabulary need to provide clearer guidelines to officers outlining the difference between anti social behaviour and harassment.
1207. This also needs to be considered when any analytical work is undertaken around reported incidents.

Conclusions

1208. The failure by police officers to identify Fiona Pilkington, her son and Francecca as a collective vulnerable family unit is at the core of Leicestershire Constabulary's failure to implement a cohesive, structured and effective approach to the harassment / anti social behaviour from which they were suffering.
1209. The fact it was the children of the household who were the subjects of the harassment and not necessarily Fiona Pilkington herself may also have been a factor in their failure to take things more seriously, despite the fact her son was obviously a repeat victim of crimes against him.
1210. The level of service given to Fiona Pilkington and her family by Leicestershire Constabulary fell far below the level expected. There were systems in place which, if utilised correctly, could have shown the true picture of harassment of the family.
1211. Although Fiona Pilkington and her family were clearly vulnerable for a number of reasons it should not be overlooked in the first instance Fiona Pilkington was a member of the local community who was reporting incidents of crime and anti social behaviour and simply asking the police to carry out their responsibilities. Ultimately, Leicestershire Constabulary failed in delivering those responsibilities.
1212. Many officers commented Bardon Road was not considered an anti

social behaviour 'hotspot' and, as it had not been highlighted to them as an issue, it was never targeted for a more proactive police response.

1213. What should have been recognised by officers who responded to incidents involving the Pilkington family, particularly in 2007, was Fiona Pilkington's repeated assertion the incidents were 'ongoing' and her family in particular were being targeted.
1214. What the officers failed to recognise and address was the difference between general anti social behaviour and harassment. Officers should have seen how this was affecting the Pilkington family and not from the officer's own point of view and 'experience' of what the area 'was like'.
1215. The Protection from Harassment Act 1997 was used by officers to tackle the problems with youths in 2004, as demonstrated by the issue of 'Harassment Warnings'. Continuing with this course of action would have given police the power to arrest offenders if any further reports of harassment were made.
1216. By 2007 officers were treating the behaviour of youths as 'anti social behaviour' and relying largely on the local council to continue action against them without fully sharing information about further reported incidents of anti social behaviour / harassment.
1217. To deal successfully with anti social behaviour the current policies rely heavily on the cooperation of offenders. Although it is recognised this does give the offender a chance to amend their behaviour, it can be a lengthy and difficult process to continue down the route to obtain Anti Social Behaviour Orders for those offenders who refuse to cooperate.
1218. This is difficult on the victims at the receiving end of the anti social behaviour which, as in Fiona Pilkington's case, continued even though anti social behaviour action had already been instigated against some local youths.
1219. Particularly in cases where offenders are not cooperating, it has to be

recognised by police forces and other agencies support needs to be offered to the victims as well as the offenders.

1220. What was also apparent from the evidence obtained during the course of the investigation was how increasingly difficult it was becoming for Fiona Pilkington to manage Francecca and how concerned she was about Francecca's future as an adult.

1221. It must be recognised since October 2007, Leicestershire Constabulary have learnt many lessons from the tragic deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick.

1222. They have made, and continue to make, significant changes to the way they deal with and respond to the type of incidents examined in this report.

Stephen Anzac Evans
Lead Investigator, IPCC

Date 7 February 2011

Addendum (2 March 2011)

1223. On Saturday 26 February 2011, the Leicester Mercury published an article in relation to legal action being taken by relatives of Fiona Pilkington. This article included a reference to 23 October 2007 stating; *'Fiona reported that the youths were walking on their hedge and imitating the way that Francecca walked. Fiona was instructed by a police officer to ignore them. Later that day, Fiona took Francecca in her car to a layby on the A47, doused the interior with petrol and set it alight. Both died'*.

1224. The investigation established the origin of this information was the verbal evidence given by Mrs. Cassell during the Inquest as follows: *'On the day that they died, Fiona rang the police up and told her that the children were walking on the hedge, she was told to ignore them, on*

that day they took the mickey out of Frankie (Francecca), they were imitating the way she walked ... I went to my other daughter on a Sunday and I got back to Fiona's house at about 1.30 at lunchtime and it was a beautifully sunny day and I said to Fiona "why have you got the curtains drawn", so she said the police had told her to so she couldn't see the girls walking on the hedge. The police told her to draw the curtains'.

1225. However, Mrs. Cassell did not refer to this incident in either of the witness statements she provided to the police on 30 October 2007 and to the IPCC on 17 March 2010.
1226. Leicestershire Constabulary confirmed they have no record of any call on their OIS system or crime on their crime recording system, CIS, which could relate to this incident on 23 October 2007.
1227. As such, the investigation has been unable to verify whether Fiona Pilkington did have any contact with police officers prior to her death on 23 October 2007.